00059194

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Government of Maharashtra
on 30 January, 2020

THE LIFE

OF

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED WITH ADDITIONAD NOTES,

BY

THE REV. MARCUS DODS, A.M.

59194

IN SIX VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO
MDCCCLXIV.

00059194

THE LIFE

OF

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS, AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

VOLUME IV.

TRANSLATED BY

REV. ROBERT ERNEST WALLIS,

PRIEST-VICAR OF WELLS CATHEDRAL, AND INCUMBENT OF COXLEY, SOMERSET.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

MDCCCLXIV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.

SECOND BOOK.

PART VI.—THE FINAL SURRENDER OF CHRIST TO THE MESSIANIC ENTHUSIASM OF HIS PEOPLE.

Page

SECT. 1. The Journey of Jesus to Jericho, and His Association with the Pilgrims to the Passover. The Renewed Prediction of His Death on the Cross. The Wish of the Family of Zebedee. The Healing of the Blind at Jericho. Zaccheus. The Parable of the Ten Servants and the Ten Pounds entrusted to them, ... 1

2. Chronological Data, ... 22

3. The Banquet at Bethany, and the Anointing. The Betrayal, 26

4. The Festal Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, ... 38

5. The single Day of the Messianic Abode and Administration of Jesus in the Temple. Especially the Cursing of the Fig-Tree. The Cleansing of the Temple. The Consecration of the Temple. The Exercise of the Teacher's Office, and the Miracles of Healing in the Temple. The Hosanna of the Children. The Indignation of the Pharisees, and its Rebuke. The Greeks, and the Voice from Heaven, . 50

6. The End of the Old Testament Theocracy. The Withered Fig-Tree. The Inquiry on the part of the Sanhedrim for Christ's Authority. The Separation between Christ and the Sanhedrim. The Parable of the Two Sons, of the Mutinous Vine-Dressers, and of the Wedding Feast of the King's Son. The Ironical Temptations of Jesus as the Theocratic King. The Counter-question of Christ. The Solemn Denunciation by Jesus of the Scribes and Pharisees. The Lamentation over Jerusalem, and the Departure from the Temple. The Look of Approval on the Widow's Mite, ... 63

Page

7. The Retrospect of Jesus on the Temple, from the top of the Mount of Olives, surrounded by His confidential Disciples. The Announcement of the Judgment of God, of the Destruction of the Holy City and of the Temple, as well as of the End of the World. The Parables of the Ten Virgins and of the Talents. The Judgment of the World —Watch! 101

8. The Withdrawal of Jesus into Retirement again. Retrospect of the Evangelist John upon the Ministry of the Lord, ... 137

PART. VII.—THE TREASON OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AGAINST THE MESSIAH. THE DECISION OF THE SANHEDRIM. THE PASCHAL LAMB, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER. THE PARTING WORDS. THE PASSION, DEATH, AND BURIAL OF JESUS. THE RECONCILING OF THE WORLD.

SECT. 1. The Last Announcement of Jesus that His Death was at hand. The Decision of the Sanhedrim. The Appointment and the Preparation of the Passover Feast, . . . 149

2. The Footwashing. The Passover. The Institution of the Holy Communion. The Parting Words of the Lord. The High-Priestly Prayer. The going out into the Mount of Olives, ... 158

3. Jesus in Gethsemane. The Struggle and Victory of His Passion of Soul, ... 263

4. Jesus in Gethsemane in the Presence of His Enemies. The Traitor. The Voluntary Surrender of Jesus to be made Prisoner. The Confidence of the Disciples, and their Flight, ... 290

5. Jesus before the Ecclesiastical Tribunal of the Jews. Before Annas and Caiaphas. The False Witnesses. The True Witness, with the Acknowledgment that He is the Son of God. The Sentence of Death. The Denial of Peter, and His Repentance. The First Mockery of the Lord. The Final Ecclesiastical Determination, . . . 304

6. Jesus brought before the Judgment-seat of Pilate. The End of Judas, ... 326

Page

7. Jesus before the Secular Tribunal. [The Threefold Charge: that He is a stirrer up of the People, a Blasphemer of God, an Enemy of Cæsar. The Three Trials: before Pilate, before Herod, and again before Pilate. The Three Warning Tokens: the Irritation of the Sanhedrim, the Dream of Pilate's Wife, the Assertion that Jesus was the Son of God. The Three Acquittals. The Three Attempts at Deliverance: Barabbas, the Scourging, the Final Resistance of Pilate. The Three Rejections of Jesus by the Jewish People. The Three Condemnations: the Delivery of Jesus to the Will of the People, the Scourging, the Delivery to Death. The Second and Third Mockery of Christ. The Handwashing of the Heathen. The Jews' Imprecation upon themselves.] The Condemnation to Death, ... 338

8. Jesus led away to Golgotha, ... 370

9. The Crucifixion. The Death of Jesus, ... 382

PART VI.

THE FINAL SURRENDER OF CHRIST TO THE MESSIANIC ENTHUSIASM OF HIS PEOPLE.

SECTION I.

THE JOURNEY OF JESUS TO JERICHO, AND HIS ASSOCIATION WITH THE PILGRIMS TO THE PASSOVER. THE RENEWED PREDICTION OF HIS DEATH ON THE CROSS. THE WISH OF THE FAMILY OF ZEBEDEE. THE HEALING OF THE BLIND AT JERICHO. ZACCHEUS. THE PARABLE OF THE TEN SERVANTS AND THE TEN POUNDS ENTRUSTED TO THEM.

(Matt. xx. 17–34; Mark x. 32–52; Luke xviii. 31–xix. 28.)

ABOUT three years previously, after His baptism, Jesus had wandered for forty days in the rocky desert near Jericho, with the definite feeling and consciousness that He must not yet surrender Himself to the Messianic expectation and enthusiasm of His people; because in this popular cry He recognised every temptation of the world and the devil. And He had then come out from the wilderness with the full determination,—while He unfolded His Messianic *life* among the people in the most abundant blessings,—to veil His Messianic *dignity* with a holy reserve, as the circumstances of the time required. And now once again He had retired into the same wilderness at its north-western borders, and once again He is occupied with the same question, whether now at length He should yield Himself to His people's Messianic hope; and as, at that time, He had at once resolved to withhold Himself

from the acknowledgment of His people, as they were then disposed towards Him, so now He decided that He could no longer reject the desire, the enthusiasm, the homage of His people; and that the time had now come when He must needs publicly confide Himself to the aspiration of Israel after its Messiah. In this opposition between the necessity for Christ's entire withdrawal of Himself from His people's homage three years before, and the necessity for His entire surrender of Himself to their allegiance *now*, are involved profound problems of the divine wisdom,—problems which can only gradually be solved in endless approximation, as in them are concentrated the deepest enigmas of the whole world's history. We can only hint at guesses and beginnings of the determination of these problems.

We must, first of all, consider the decision of Christ as accomplished. When He the first time came out of the wilderness, He turned Himself to the most distinguished among the people, in order gradually to unfold His abundant divine life to them. *Now* He comes forth from the wilderness to the people themselves, and allows the supposition to gain ground among them that He is the King of Israel, and that He intends soon to take possession of His kingdom. In the adoption of these distinct plans, however, the Lord was influenced altogether by the circumstances of the time. Had He, three years before, confided Himself to the people, He must have announced Himself by the name of the Messiah; in which case the people in their carnal enthusiasm would have attributed to Him the Messianic dispositions, undertakings, works, and signs, which would accord with such expectations as had been illustrated in the three great temptations. But now He had unfolded the *genuine* Messianic spirit, the truly Messianic purpose, in its works and signs. He had authenticated and revealed Himself as Messiah, conformably to His own will, in His Spirit, *i.e.*, in the Spirit of God. And when the people *now* greeted Him by the name of Messiah, it was not done in a Jewish chiliastic sense, but with the dim presentiments, at any rate, of the higher Christologic recognition.

For this reason also, the consequence of His surrender of Himself to the people was entirely different *now* from what it would have been three years before. At that time, the first result would have been the breaking out of a tremendous popular disturbance. An unutterable confusion would have followed

thereupon; and if Christ had opposed Himself to this terrible intoxication, He would have been sacrificed to the hatred of the people. Then, however, there would have been no *society* which could at all have understood the meaning of His sacrifice, or could have received it with heartfelt appreciation. It was otherwise now. His life had already originated a separation between the more noble and the more ignoble elements in the Jewish expectation of the Messiah. The palm-procession was the expression of the better hopes of His people; and therefore it presented an appearance so sublime, and was so dignified by the spiritual consecration of His presence, as if it had been a pure and beautiful vision of heaven,—a spirit procession of blissful men to the feast of their Lord, appearing here for a moment in the midday-light of earthly reality, and then passing away. The worldly spirit, that was the special evil in the Jewish hope of the Messiah, had already fallen away from this heavenly vision, and had placed itself in direct opposition to it; so that the palm-procession also was ignorantly hushed up by the foreboding of the opposed hostile power, while, on the contrary, the tears of the grief of Christ hallowed it. Yes! this noble eagerness for the Messiah in Israel was so little beside desire, hope, and longing, so much of a womanly cry (bridelike cry of the people perhaps), that it was not able to protect the Lord against the designs of the hostile power opposed to Him; so that almost immediately upon the 'Hosanna,' followed the 'Crucify Him!' But in this weakness of the growing society of Christ lay also its power. The Lord had now trained for Himself a company of disciples, who could allow His crucifixion to occur without obscuring its pure influence with fanatical deeds of violence; who could see Him die on the cross without altogether despairing of His truth and dignity, and of His kingdom; and who, after all, were altogether matured for the purpose of adopting in themselves the faith in the crucified Saviour of the world.

And this leads us to the most real and substantial solution of the question, Why Jesus could not yield to the allegiance of the people three years before, and yet could do so now? We should neither be able, nor do we wish, to conceive what would have been the result, had there been at that earlier time a Messianic entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. But we know this, from this

procession *now* followed the crucifixion, and from the crucifixion issued the salvation of the world.

Here, however, the inquiry might be suggested, Why did Jesus surrender Himself to the homage of His people, if He foresaw that this homage would prove a failure, and that from it would proceed the treason of the people against His life and the crucifixion? And this question brings us to the probable historical cause which induced the Lord to yield Himself in this public manner to His people. It is certain He could no longer refuse them this surrender now. His nation's most intense expectation called Him to the holy city and to the holy place. In accordance with the laws of the life of the Israelitish people,—in accordance with the predictions of the prophets,—He must now for once respond to this expectation, if He would fulfil all righteousness. Only thus could the authentication of His righteousness, and its testimony to His people and to humanity, be accomplished. It must be manifested how the Jewish nation, and how the whole of humanity in its earthly blindness, could treat, and actually does treat, all its ideals,—all beautiful bright forms of its carnal hope; yes, even its most deeply inspired expectation, the entire kingdom of heaven it had longed for, and its actual and glorious divine heritage. But as Christ must meet the expectation of His people in general, so also must He meet the claims of His foes. They had published the order, that whoever knew His place of abode should declare it. Now it was His care publicly to give account to the spirit of enmity which pursued Him with this mandate, certainly not with nervous haste, but at such an hour as was fitting for His princely dignity. But, finally, He must confide Himself fully for once to the hopeful heart of His own friends, to their anticipations, and to their faithful vows. It must be seen how they would defend their Christ, or how they would suffer with Him. Thus, therefore, a threefold necessity summoned Him to this public arena. Once Satan had called Him thrice to the stage, and He did not appear. Now the Father called Him by His name,—thrice, it may be said, since He called Him by a threefold motive,—and Jesus came forth at once out of the wilderness to accomplish His will.

When Jesus with His disciples now departed from Ephraim, it was evident that He was going with them to meet the last crisis of His destiny. It was then at once declared that He

would give Himself up to His people, and be publicly honoured as Messiah. But that was just the moment to which the disciples had looked with all the aspiration and hope of their hearts, from the first hour in which they had devoted themselves to Him. It is easily conceived, therefore, that now all their Messianic hopes revived again more mightily than ever.

But the misgivings also which Jesus had suggested to them by His repeated warnings of His suffering, and which the terribly evident hostile relation of the hierarchy had already so often confirmed, must now have awakened in their full strength. And thus they were thrown into a state of extraordinary agitation and suspense, which the Evangelist Mark has depicted in clear strong lines (chap. x. 32). They were full of astonishment and terror (ἐθαμβοῦντο) at the tremendous solution of the vast problem behind which they expected death and life, hell pains and heavenly glory, suddenly standing before them so closely. With glad excitement and devotion, but also with trembling, they followed the Lord (ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο). But Jesus found it needful once again to predict to them His end with the greatest accuracy; and not only His suffering, but also His resurrection. For it was necessary for them also to know what glory they had to expect, that they might not mistake His dignity and royalty, and in order that they might not be perverted by doubts in the night of the tempest of His tribulation (*Kreuzes-sturms*). Thus, therefore, the prediction was at this time more definite than ever. Especially the Lord now brings forward from the earlier announcement of His rejection, that the Son of man should be delivered into the hands of sinful men, the two terrible features, that one (of the company of His own disciples) should deliver Him to the high priests and scribes; and that these, after they had condemned Him to death, should abandon Him to the Gentiles,—abandon their Messiah to the Gentiles,—for complete temporal destruction. Moreover, He particularized the three chief modes of this destruction, when He announced that He should be delivered to the Gentiles for mockery (amidst insults and spitting), for scourging, and for crucifying; and that He would thus incur a threefold worldly destruction, of which, according to human justice, the first form ought in reason to exclude the second, and the second the third, since it is an especial outrage to scourge Him who is already

degraded by mockery, and to add crucifixion to Him who is degraded by scourging, or inversely to execute Him who is destroyed in the third manner, in either of the other two modes.

Although, however, Jesus announced to His disciples as clearly as possible His resurrection on the third day, they could not even now acquiesce in another announcement, which seemed so sharply to cross their high anticipations. The Evangelist Luke again puts it forward very expressively, how utterly incapable they were in their state of mind of clearly understanding the declaration of Jesus, and accommodating themselves inwardly to it. This want of understanding was of a threefold character, as is generally the case under similar circumstances. They did not readily enter into the meaning of the word of Jesus (*οὐδέν συνῆκαν*). The consequence was the judicial award of God, that therefore from them also the meaning of the saying of Jesus should be hidden (*ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα κεκρυμμένον*), and that resulted now in their not comprehending effectually the sense of what was said by Jesus (*οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον*).[1]

That the disciples did not perfectly receive into their hearts the prediction of the Lord, is manifest in the clearest manner from the solicitude of the children of Zebedee, James and John, which was brought under His notice about this time by Salome. Before we consider this desire, the question presses upon us, How comes Salome at this time into the company of Jesus? We know that she was among the women who had already, at an earlier period, begun to accompany and to care for the Lord. And thus it may be conjectured, that she has still continued to be among His followers. Only, on the other hand, the circumstance might seem to contradict this, that Jesus had of late sought to live as far as possible concealed in Ephraim, and therefore would not safely retain in His company more disciples than the twelve. And thus it is probable, that during the concealment of Jesus, Salome had not been among His followers. But from the circumstance, that Jesus had already a considerable attendance when He entered into Jericho, we are led to the supposition, that His special friends and dependants in Galilee, travelling through Samaria, had already met with Him in Ephraim, and were approaching Jericho in His company. Doubtless the enthusiastic and courageous woman Salome was

[1] Luke ix. 45. See above, II., v. 13.

also in this procession. And on the way to Jericho she had time, with her sons, to mature the petition which she desired to lay before the Lord. According to the representation of the Evangelist Mark, it must be supposed that the presentation of this petition occurred while they were still on the way to Jericho, perhaps immediately before Jesus fell in with the larger companies of pilgrims.

There is no real difficulty in the fact that Matthew relates, that the mother of Zebedee's children had come forward with them, had cast herself down before Jesus, and had besought a favour from Him; while, on the other hand, the Evangelist Mark places this address in the mouth of the two aspirants themselves. Mark declares, that the urgent motive of the request substantially existed in the disciples; while Matthew more accurately gives us the form in which they preferred the request, namely, through the mother, who certainly, in accordance with her ambitious character, was at one with her sons in their desire. But the statement of the request is characteristic. Here, first of all, Salome was treating the Lord as the Messianic Prince of the kingdom. Prostrating herself at His feet, she besought of Him a favour; and to the simple question of Jesus, 'What would ye that I should do for you?' followed the request, that He would grant to her sons to occupy the places at His right hand and at His left in His kingdom. How would the Lord sadly smile at this request! They had no sort of presentiment what terrible places of honour they would have shortly attained if their wish had been accorded them, namely, the places of the two thieves who were crucified with Jesus, at His right hand and at His left. 'Ye know not what ye ask!' said the Lord, doubtless with a shudder in His soul at the absence of foreboding with which His beloved disciples could ask a thousand times for that which was perilous, or even destructive, and still oftener for that which was unreasonable. For not only the want of foreboding with which they asked for themselves the places of the thieves, but also the arrogant regardlessness with which they aspired above all the other disciples, deserved a repulse. Yet Jesus had in view chiefly that unconscious desire for misfortune in their request when He continued His address: 'Can ye drink of the cup which I shall drink of,[1] and be bap-

[1] Jer. xlix. 12.

tized with the baptism that I shall be baptized with?'[1] They utter the bold word, 'We can.' And therewith it was at that time declared, that in their desire they were in any case prepared for sorrows—that they would gladly be ready to share with the Lord His tribulation, in order to enter with Him into His glory. For it could not escape these disciples, especially John, that He now referred to a cup of sorrow that He should be compelled to drink, and to a baptism of tribulation with which He must be baptized, before His entrance into glory. And if their declaration, 'We can,' be estimated according to its real worth, it cannot be mistaken that our Lord acknowledges in some measure the truth of their declaration. He does not at all announce to them, as to Peter, that in the hour of affliction they would deny Him. He acknowledges that these Sons of Thunder, in their eager attachment to Him, in their fiery enthusiasm and magnanimity, and possessing the germs of the Spirit, could already accomplish something considerable. That they could not yet, however, die with Him, in the power and in the meaning of His Spirit, and are not yet called upon to die with Him, according to the spirit of their conduct—this He gently intimates; whilst He announces to them that they shall surely one day drink His cup with Him—share His baptism with Him. And surely this was true as well of John as of James; for although the former died a natural death, the latter, on the contrary, under the executioner's sword, as a martyr, still John had no small share of inward sympathy with the suffering and with the death of Jesus. Yes, in proportion to his deeper life, he could even take a deeper draught out of the cup of Christ's sorrow than the martyr James himself. After the Lord had in this manner promised to the disciples that they should share with Him His cup and His baptism, He nevertheless returns to them their request with the words, 'but to sit on My right hand and on My left hand is not Mine to give, but to them for whom it is prepared of My Father (it shall be given).' This depends not merely on the decree of earthly destiny which comes from the Father, and according to which the two thieves were crucified with Christ, but rather on the everlasting pre-appointment of eternal arrangements in the kingdom of God, which was established upon the endowment with eternal gifts, as this pre-

[1] Luke xii. 50.

appointment always specially belongs to the control of the Father. It is deeply to be weighed here, how accurately Christ distinguishes between the sphere of His own rule and that of His Father's.

The question might here arise, If Jesus at all intended to correct the two disciples in their desire, wherefore He should, as it were, upbraid them with the counter-question, whether they could drink His cup, and be baptized with His baptism? The difficulty, however, is solved, when we remember the double meaning alluded to already, which, unconsciously to the disciples, was hidden in their request. They wished at once to occupy the places at His right hand and at His left. Herein they had unwittingly asked for the lot of the two thieves. And it is in this sense that Jesus says to them, Ye know not what ye ask. Can ye share My sufferings? When they in reply assure Him that they can, their words assume another meaning, which the Lord partially acknowledges, in promising them that they should surely undergo with Him all His sufferings. But from such sympathy does not result the place at His right hand and at His left, either here in His deepest humiliation, or hereafter in His highest glory.

The desire of the sons of Zebedee was probably not merely an ambitious effort after dignity; it was inspired by a nobler motive. Rather their wish was, now that the Lord had spoken so plainly of His suffering, and perhaps some of the band of disciples might be terribly discouraged thereby, to express in the strongest way the confidence with which they, on their part, anticipated His glorification. Without undervaluing the significance of His sorrowful predictions, they were desirous, in their noble and magnanimous nature, of making known that they nevertheless were ready, and counted it the highest happiness of their life, to partake in the most intimate manner with Jesus, in His future circumstances and destiny, and to associate their future altogether with His. Certainly they did not forebode how soon and how sadly His career would descend into the death of the cross. At all events, however, it is probable that their request was not free from the elements of an ambitious aspiration. And thus there appears in this scene a marked contrast with the great prediction of suffering that so immediately preceded it. But this contrast is most peculiar, precisely at the

moment when Jesus warns His disciples that He should die on the cross, amid all possible worldly ignominy, and when immediately thereupon the mother Salome advances, and asks for her sons the two places on the right and on the left hand of Jesus.

When the ten disciples of Jesus were aware of the application of the two brothers and its refusal, and the explanation of Jesus, they were indignant at them. This was not the first time that the question had been raised among them, who should be the greatest? According to the positions which Peter and John usually occupied in relation to Jesus, it was natural, upon their old principles of life, that they should seek to obtain precedence of one another, and that not only factions should be formed in the band of disciples for the one and the other, but, moreover, that special claims should be alleged of third persons besides. But only lately the Lord had most strongly discountenanced these emulations of the disciples. Probably since that time they had not allowed any more of their endeavours to transpire. Therefore it seemed a double wrong done to the company of disciples, that these two, with the help of their mother, should at once seek to carry away this distinction. Their pretensions easily kindled the eagerness of the pretensions of the rest again. Moreover, the absolute refusal which *they* met with from Him, might seem to authorize some among the rest to entertain new hopes. At any rate, they appeared entitled to be much displeased with the attempts of the two. But Jesus discountenanced this indignation just as much as He had all old and new pretensions of the kind, by a decided reprimand. He called them together, and in the assembled circle of disciples—shall we say, in the council of apostles—He spake thus: 'Ye know that the acknowledged *princes* of the peoples[1] rule over them from above,[2] and that the great ones among them from above exercise power over them.[3] (That the acknowledged visible powers from a high throne exercise their dominion, and that the still unacknowledged mighty ones masterfully attain dominion over

[1] (Οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν.) In this expression we may observe an allusion to the symbolic meaning in the earthly power of princes, and translate: 'The princes in the world of appearances;' or, 'The phenomenal-world-princes.'

[2] Κατακυριεύουσι. [3] Κατεξουσιάζουσι.

princes and peoples.) *But so it ought not to be among you!* But whosoever among you will be great, let him be your minister; and whosoever among you will be the first, let him be your servant.' Thus, therefore, there is recognised no ascendancy of *power* in the kingdom of Christ other than that which proceeds out of *loving ministry*, and no ascendancy of *lawful dignity* other than that which proceeds from the *real service* of the individual on behalf of the community. These negative and positive instructions of Christ are just as strict as they are full, just as precise as they are unlimited. They find their complete illustration only in the fullest life of the Spirit, the meekness, love, and liberty of the faithful. Moreover, they are not at all to be considered as mere paradoxes, which would abrogate the rightful relations in the congregation, but as the most delicate outlines by which they ought to be regulated; above all, there should be no manner of unqualified supremacy in the congregation which does not stand to the community on terms of continual modification and reciprocity.[1] No dignity in the congregation ought to have any value as ordained over it in the abstract, but only such as is renewed from time to time by the free acknowledgment of the people. And in this connection the imperious *psychic* tyranny of the illegitimate powers of heresiarchs and leaders of sects of all kinds, ought to be rejected not less than the overbearing rule of legitimately established visible powers of a spiritual kind. But that control which proceeds out of the service of love towards the members of the community, ought to prevail as *power* and *greatness* in the congregation, according to the measure of its ability, and of the popular right subsisting therein; and that office which proceeds on the surrender of oneself as a servant to the Spirit and Lord in the congregation ought to be accounted a priority, a government in the community, just in consequence of the fact that the bearer of the office becomes a servant of the Lord of the congregation, in conformity with the authority which the Lord has given to Him, and which the congregation have given to Him. But when individuals in the community claim a power and an

[1] The intention of Jesus, that in this respect it should not be in His Church as it is in the visible world, where the government of dignity and power is more or less only symbolical, is expressed in the fact that every hierarchy is allied with despotism, every despotism with the hierarchy.

authority contrary to the Spirit, the privilege, the life, and will of the congregation, the people are instructed to degrade them in the same degree in which *they* would exalt themselves. They must in such a case be recognised as symbolical taskmasters for Christ, and therefore be degraded into ministers and servants of the free community in the legal sense.

No man ought to seek to rule over the people of God, since, as the Lord says in conclusion, 'the Son of man Himself is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom (λύτρον) for many.' He Himself has established this church by ministry, by the great service of love. Therefore it cannot be built up by the lordly rule of His servants over it, but only by a service of love like to His own. Yea, He has redeemed it from all service with the costly purchase-money of His life and blood, and formed it into a free society. Such a society of such redeemed ones made free by such a ransom is the free community in the highest sense; it should never be enslaved, least of all by a horribly despotic effusion of the blood of its members.

So long as the world needs visible powers and dominions, it finds them, according to the counsel and will of God, among the princes and mighty ones of the peoples. The apostles of the Lord, in their peculiarly symbolical pædagogic control, ought neither to wish to emulate them, nor to supplant and restore them, nor yet to complete them.

When Jesus came to Jericho from Ephraim, in order there to join a large festal procession, He would not perhaps in any case make His entry and His exit through the two gates of the city that are placed opposite to one another. He did not come from Jordan through the eastern gate, which leads out upon the road to Peræa, but He approached the city from the north-west, while He would leave it again in a south-westerly direction, on the way to Jerusalem. It is possible, also, that He might have entered the city through the same gate by which He left it again later; possibly, also, He might have approached through a road of the Jordan valley, and have cut through part of Jericho, and so have pursued His journey with the festal caravan on the rocky road towards Jerusalem.

It is confessedly a difficult problem to reconcile with one another the several accounts of the Synoptic Evangelists of the

cure of the blind men which Jesus performed at Jericho. Matthew, for instance, relates that Jesus had given sight to two blind men on His departure from Jericho. Mark informs us only of the healing of *one* blind man, which, in conformity with Matthew's account, occurred as Jesus left Jericho. On the other hand, Luke speaks of the healing of one blind man, which the Lord performed at His entrance into that city. At the same time, however, it is worthy of note that the circumstances under which, according to the various descriptions, these several cures occurred, very much accord with one another.

It might be possible to seek to throw light on this difficulty, by supposing that Jesus entered and left Jericho by one and the same gate. The order of events might be conceived of somewhat after the following manner. The blind man sat near the gate through which Jesus at first entered, and afterwards left, the city. He began even at the entrance of Jesus to cry to Him for help. Being, however, at some distance from the procession, he was threatened and put to silence by some who would now suffer no delay, and thus his prayer did not reach the ear of Jesus. But now, when the Lord was returning through the same gate, he prosecutes his appeal; and presses through the opposition of those who would restrain him with his cry; the rather that the right time had arrived for the Lord to help him. It is at this point that Mark has taken up this history, and has represented it in a close and lively manner. It may be seen that he was accurately acquainted with the facts; he names the blind beggar, he is called Bartimæus. But he took up the circumstance, that the beggar had already sought help and been checked at the entrance of Jesus, into the representation of this moment. On the other hand, Luke heard tell that the beggar had already cried to Jesus before His entry. Perhaps this fact was made clear to him by an indication of the place where the beggar had been seated when Jesus drew near to the city. In the meantime, it escaped his notice that the cure itself did not occur till the departure of Jesus. Thus Luke was induced to place the miracle before the entrance of Jesus; Matthew, on the contrary, transposed it, with Mark, to the departure of Jesus from Jericho. But when the later Greek reviser of the Hebrew Matthew met with the narratives of the other two Evangelists, he combined them, and thence

would arise his representation, according to which there occurred the cure of two blind men.

That which most commends this hypothesis is the extraordinary similarity that may be observed between the account of the healing of the blind which Mark relates to us, and that which Luke relates. The striking character of this resemblance cannot in fact be so easily got over, if we suppose, with Ebrard,[1] that *two* cures occurred, one at the entrance, another at the departure of Jesus. But the circumstance would indeed become the more peculiar if actual variations should be found in the two accounts, which would suggest a difference in the individual behaviour of the two blind men. Such a variation Ebrard discovers in the fact, that the blind man of Mark, 'at the mere call, throws away his garment, rises, and in manifest eagerness comes forward to Jesus, while the blind man of Luke is *led* to Jesus.' This latter circumstance, however, is not quite so certain. According to Luke, Jesus commanded the blind man to be brought to Him. But it is not therefore said that the blind man actually allowed himself to be led to Him, and that he did not, at this call, in joyous excitement throw away his garment and follow the sound of the voice of Jesus, as one that through faith was already half-endowed with sight.

It must by all means be observed, that it is not quite determined that Jesus went in and out of Jericho by the same gate. He might, however, have entered the city from the Jordan valley by a northern gate. On the other hand, the blind beggar might have found it to his interest on this occasion to have changed his position. At all events, the healing of the blind man which Luke relates, so nearly resembles the cure of Bartimæus in Mark, in the characteristic features of its treatment, that it is easier to suppose that an inaccuracy has occurred in reference to the statement of the time, than that the narrative of Luke has been in some degree coloured up to the tradition of Mark, as must, at least according to appearances, have been the case otherwise in this place.[2]

But even if the cure of the blind man which Luke relates

[1] *Gospel History*, p. 364.

[2] The supposition of Neander, that Luke has rightly stated the time of the miracle, and Mark wrongly, is rendered very unlikely by the circumstance, that in this case Matthew is on the side of Mark.

should, on the grounds specified, be identical with that of Mark, there is on that account no necessity to refer the cure of a second blind man, which Matthew in his narrative includes with the great characteristic healing of the blind, to a misunderstanding of the later reviser. Rather it is extremely probable that the Evangelist here also, after his custom of bringing together contemporary miracles of a similar kind,[1] combined a cure of the blind which occurred of smaller importance with the greater one, which the Evangelic memory especially retained. In accordance with these observations we must return to the cure of the blind by Jesus, at the narrative of the departure of Jesus from Jericho.

Already at His entrance Jesus was surrounded, according to Luke, by a crowd of people. This crowd consisted, as has been already observed, partly of Galilean friends who had joined Him on the direct way through Samaria, partly perhaps, besides, of Passover pilgrims and inhabitants of Jericho, who had come out of Jericho to meet Him.

The city of Jericho, characterized by its name as the city of Fragrance,[2] was the famous palm city of the Jews, whose neighbourhood was peculiarly celebrated as an exqusite *region of heaven*. The land 'wherein flowed milk and honey,' presented in that valley, which is watered by the wonderful spring of Elisha, the most perfect illustration of His blessing in spite of the poisonous serpents that were bred by the hot temperature of that deep valley, shut in by high rocks and permeated by warm mists from Jordan. There bloomed the princely plants, the palm, the balsam-tree, and the rose-tree, in the midst of a luxuriant and fragrant vegetable kingdom.[3] In the history before us, however, this natural glory of Jericho is not represented by

[1] Compare what is said above on the healing of the Gadarene demoniacs.

[2] Sepp. iii. 160.

[3] ['Jericho, where is the garden of Abraham, is ten leagues from Jerusalem, in a land covered with trees, and producing all kinds of palms and other fruits. There is the well of the prophet Elisha, the water of which was most bitter to drink, and productive of sterility, until he blessed it and threw salt into it, when it became sweet. This place is surrounded on every side by a beautiful plain.'—Sæwulf's *Travels*, p. 45. [Bohn.] 'The "rose of Jericho" is not a rose, and does not grow near Jericho.'—Kitto, *Land of Promise*, p. 37, where an interesting description of the fertility of the plain is given.—ED.]

the rose of Jericho, but by a sycamore-tree, which just at this time bore a wonderful fruit of the noblest kind.

Jericho was, above many others, a city of priests and of publicans. It might perhaps be pleasing to the priests to lead a life of contemplative quiet here, in the fulness of the blessing of their land, under the palm which was the symbol of their country. But it was in consequence of the commercial relations of the land, that, in contrast to its numerous priesthood, it numbered just as many publicans. It was not only that there was much custom to pay here, because the produce of the neighbourhood of Jericho was abundant, but also because the city lay on the road from Peræa to Jerusalem, near to one of the fords of Jordan.

But now it happened that in this hasty, it may be said brief,[1] passage through Jericho, our Lord did not abide at the house of one of the many priests who dwelt there, but at the house of a publican.[2] This history, which tradition has spared, formed part of those which Luke with the greatest delight collected. He relates it with joyous excitement (*καὶ ἰδοὺ*). At Jericho dwelt an important citizen, Zaccheus by name, a superior collector of taxes,[3] who was known as a wealthy man. This person earnestly wished to see Jesus as He passed through, that He might have some idea of His appearance (*τὶς ἐστι*). But as he was little of stature, and the people crowded round the Lord, he could not get a sight of Him. But he would and must see Him; that was evident in his determination to forego all the propriety of a person of consequence; so he ran forward

[1] Schleiermacher, in his work '*über den Lukas*' (p. 237), and Hug in his '*Gutachten*,' etc. (ii. 91), suppose that Jesus passed the night in Jericho at the house of Zaccheus. But this supposition is not altogether justified by the expressions, *δεῖ με μεῖναι*, and *εἰσῆλθε καταλῦσαι*; whilst the *εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο* leaves us to infer a passing through. Moreover, in such a case we must well consider that, according to John xii. 12, Jesus made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem not from Jericho, but from Bethany. But we can hardly suppose that before His public entry into Jerusalem, He had already entered privately. After His departure from Jericho, too, He can at the most have reached Bethany on the same day. But the procession might travel over this distance, even although it did not actually journey from Jericho through the mountain wilderness in the early morning.

[2] Rauschenbusch, *das Leben Jesu*, p. 286.

[3] On this designation see Stier, iv. 314. [Also Jahn's *Biblical Antiq.*, sec. 242; and Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*, art. Publicani.]

and climbed up on a sycamore tree (such as grew in abundance on the roads in Palestine), in a place where Jesus must needs pass by. Possibly, perhaps, he may in his haste have offended some who saw him run, and his name may have been mentioned among them, coupled with scoffing remarks. At any rate, Jesus may easily have learnt his name somewhere. When He came near to the tree He looked up, and the glance of the Saviour of mankind met that of a soul that needed salvation. Thus the Lord finds out His own people everywhere, even in the most peculiar circumstances. But this man did not perhaps know how it befell that Jesus knew him by name, when He called him down from the tree, and invited Himself to his house as a guest, announcing that to-day He would abide at his house for a time. Zaccheus quickly left his position and joyfully welcomed his dignified guest.

At this moment it is once more made manifest how little of true attachment was mingled with the homage that Jesus received from those who accompanied Him. There spread through the crowd a considerable murmur at His seeking refreshment at the house of so notorious a sinner. Zaccheus appeared to them a sinner with reference to the Jewish community; therefore Jesus seemed to them, by the confidential intercourse into which He entered with such a man, to compromise the whole body of His companions in its social purity and consideration. But the fault-finders were soon shamed by the grand act of Zaccheus, which manifested that now his heart was celebrating the birth-hour of a new life. He came forward to the Lord, and uttered the vow, 'Behold the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have at all over-reached anybody at any time, I will repay it fourfold.'[1] Certainly this man was no real deceiver: for he knew by sure calculation that he could, first of all, bestow half of his possessions on the poor; that he then, moreover, of the other half, could repair fourfold every fraud of which he might have incurred the guilt; and that, after all, there would probably still be left a sufficiency for his maintenance. Thus this filling

[1] 'The highest restitution which the lawgiver appointed for stolen property (Exod. xxiii. 37 (?)). Whoever acknowledged his own sin, paid only the sum stolen, and a fifth part (Num. v. 6).'—De Wette, *Lukas*, p. 96. Compare Exod. xxii. 1, *et seq.*

up of His offer indicates most strongly the consciousness of the upright man in a commercial sense. And yet just thus is defined the consciousness of the sinner. He does not conceal that he may have fallen into sin, at least through some more subtle fraud, for he feels now that his former gains have become vanity. He represents this as being very probable, although it is not evident to him what responsibility might fall upon him in this respect. It was a great moment of trial for him when he came before Jesus so confidently with this bold undertaking. If his deed had been a mere act of appearance, of selfishness, or of self-righteousness, he could not have stood before the eyes of Jesus. Jesus looked through him, and found that the act was an expression of his enfranchisement. The form of His answer indicates as much. Just for that reason, because this day is salvation come to this house. On that day the house had become poorer in earthly possessions by one-half, and perhaps a great deal more; but Jesus, nevertheless, considers the house fortunate, because on that day it had found the true heavenly treasure. Zaccheus had done to the poor a great and glorious benefit; but Jesus does not call the poor fortunate, but considers him blessed: and that not so much for the good that he did, as for the salvation that he received. In fact, He perceived, from the offering that Zaccheus made, that salvation had come to him—that he had experienced the power of grace to the regeneration of his life. Then He turned to the accusers of the man thus blessed, with the words, 'for that he also is a son of Abraham.'

They had not considered that the publican was a son of Abraham according to race, when they wanted to abandon him without love, as incapable of becoming better; and they did not anticipate that he might even in a higher sense become a son of Abraham by his soul's need of salvation, and by faith. But now they must know, that in the fullest sense he is Abraham's son: so that for the future, they must no longer prevent his receiving grace by their narrow-hearted judicial restraints. Precisely because he was Abraham's son, he was, in virtue of his sinful publican's life, a *lost one;* and because he was a *lost one,* because he had sunk below his original worth and destiny, and was capable of a restoration and return to a higher life, therefore Christ has sought him. For just therein, says He, consists His entire mission, that He might seek and save that which is lost.

The Lord thus charges those who had blamed Him, first of all, with having, in the *publican*, despised the *Jew*—then, the man who was in need of salvation—and finally, the man desirous of salvation, and the man actually visited and taken possession of by salvation. And whilst He declared to them that it was, and continued to be, His mission to seek the lost, He gave them to understand how they themselves must be found, if they would have a share in His salvation.

The greater the distance between the original and historical destination of a man and his actual sinfulness, the more is he a subject for the seeking compassion of Christ. And the more heartfelt has been a man's sense of this distance, the nearer is his salvation to him. But those who conceive that their actual condition is at one with their destination, or even beyond it in excellence, these are entirely alienated from it. They are prone to see only outcasts in the prodigals; and they attribute this kind of consideration also to the Lord. They would reduce the Saviour of the world always to a Prince of the Pharisees; but He would rather be crucified with the thieves than abandon the lost. For Him the two are identical. They are Abraham's sons; just for that reason (that they are so) they are lost. They are lost (they feel themselves so in their deep degradation from their destination); for that very reason they are Abraham's sons.

With this declaration, and the visit to Zaccheus on which it was founded, the Lord had again come into direct opposition to the Pharisaic spirit. Moreover, He found it necessary once more decidedly to repulse not only the legal Pharisaism which wished again to obtrude itself on Him, but also the chiliastic Pharisaism. For His hearers thought, that when He was now so near to Jerusalem as Messiah, the kingdom of heaven would manifestly appear. Therefore He added (προσθεὶς), to what had been said, the parable of the ten servants, who were to trade with ten pounds in the absence of their lord. That feature of the parable, especially, would serve for a reproof of those enthusiastic chiliasts, according to which the Lord was just on the point of going into a strange country to receive there the dominion over His citizens, while they purposed utterly to reject His claims. He could not more plainly say to them that they would find themselves disappointed in their expectations. And

when, moreover, He described the apparently small traffic wherein, in the meantime, His true servants would seek to further His cause by peaceable gains, as if that revolution were nothing to them, He told them plainly how remote was the vocation of His people from political enterprises, which would seek as their result to force upon the world a political and external acknowledgment of Christ—so remote indeed, that a certain critic could see, even in the genuine endeavour of the faithful in the world, and in the political agitation of the world itself, to get rid of the dimly anticipated dominion of Christ, two independent parables.[1]

Nevertheless, however, that the Lord allowed Himself now to be publicly acknowledged as Messiah, was the result of the history of the cure of the blind man, which He performed at His departure from Jericho. Once He attended, not publicly, to the cry of the blind man who wished to proclaim Him prematurely as the Son of David. But now He stood still when He noticed the call of Bartimæus, the son of Timæus, who besought Him, 'Jesus, Thou Son of David, have mercy upon me.' Although now great crowds surrounded Him, and although many sought to silence the blind man, some perhaps because such a public glorification of Jesus was grievous to them, others because they might think that the time for these single miracles of healing of Jesus was now gone by, and that the progress of the great King ought not to be checked any more by the case of blind beggars. But when Jesus stood still, and commanded that he who cried for help should be brought to Him, the beggar immediately found sympathizers enough.

Many were in the company around Jesus who bade fair to become supple courtiers in the service of the great Son of David: they first wished proudly to dismiss the beggar, because the eminence of Jesus appeared to them to require that course; but as soon as He declared Himself in his behalf, they were even courteous to him, and now they say, 'Be comforted, rise; He calleth thee.' Still it was truly the genuine disciples of the Lord who in the best sense encouraged the blind man in such a manner to come forward. Then he threw away his beggar's cloak, arose, and came forward to Jesus, as if in the marvellous light of the promise of Jesus he had been at once made to see clearly.

[1] See above; compare Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 636.

'What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?' asked the great King of the poor beggar; and he answered, 'Lord, that I may be made to see;' and he received the miraculous help, with the word, 'Receive thy sight; thy faith hath saved thee.' Then he looked up, and saw. He looked upon a wonderful world, a picture of heaven upon earth, on the Lord surrounded by the great festal company. And now his heart burst forth in praise and thanksgiving; and at once he joined the procession, in which he believed that he saw with his eyes the special resting-place of his faith.

The other healing of the blind, which, according to Matthew, occurred nearly about the same time, seems to have been performed in another form, namely, by laying of the hand on the eyes of the sick man. By the combination of the narratives, this form was then referred to both cures.

The procession of festal pilgrims now moved towards the rocky desert of Judæa, which separates Jericho from Jerusalem, —that desert in which, according to the narrative of the Lord, the traveller who came from Jerusalem fell among the thieves, and was delivered by the merciful Samaritan.[1] Probably this desert was traversed on this day. But as the solitude begins gradually to decrease, about two leagues distance from Bethany,[2] it may be supposed that the procession only reached Bethany. Here, probably, Christ separated for a while from the company, which would encamp in the neighbourhood of the Mount of Olives, to turn in to the house of His friends at Bethany.

NOTES.

1. Neander also supposes that Jesus went out from Ephraim to meet the Galilean caravan towards Jericho.

2. On the various explanations of the differences in the Synoptic Gospels in respect of the healing of the blind man at Jericho, compare Strauss, ii. 55. [Upwards of twelve explanations are given in Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, p. 341. But between the opinion of Augustine, that there were three men, and that of Alford, that there was a discrepancy in the sources from which the Evangelists drew their narratives, there is no logically

[1] Read the lively picture of this desert in Von Schubert's *Reise in das Morgenland*, iii. 72.

[2] Von Schubert, iii. 71.

unassailable position. The difficulties against supposing three men are most unduly magnified by Trench, p. 429. Is it so unusual a thing for blind beggars to use the same words? or is it very improbable that the man of whom Luke speaks should have told the others how he had been healed, and that they should conceive it safe to use the same words as he had done? That Jesus should in both cases have stood still, and demanded what they wanted, is so far from being 'unnatural and improbable,' that it is impossible to conceive how else He could have acted in the circumstances. If there was not one man healed at the entrance to Jericho, and two healed at the departure from it, then one or other of the Evangelists is in error; and his statement must be not only supplemented, but *corrected*, by the statements of the others. The refutation which Trench very fairly gives of Grotius' view applies with equal justice to his own.—ED.]

SECTION II.

CHRONOLOGICAL DATA.

That Jesus rose from the dead on a Sunday is an incontestible fact, confirmed as well by the Evangelists as by the Apostolic Church (compare Luke xxiv. 1).

Equally certain is it, that on the third day previously, viz., on a Friday, He was crucified (Luke xxiv. 21).

The Synoptists were entirely agreed in pointing out this day as the first day of the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 2; Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxiii. 54). Of late, however, there have been attempts to show that John has contradicted this testimony. It is maintained that, according to John, Christ must have been crucified on the day before the Passover. But such assertions depend upon the erroneous explanations of many expressions of John, and might now be considered as set aside.[1] Nay, if the expressions of John be pondered in their full significance, he will be found to have declared more accurately than the rest of the

[1] Vol. i. p. 199. Wieseler, 333. Ebrard, *das Evangelium Johannes*, p. 42.

Evangelists, that Jesus was crucified on a Friday,[1] and that it was on the first day of the Passover (viz., on the 15th Nisan[2]). According to the determination of the general chronology of the life of Jesus, which we adopt,[3] Jesus was crucified in the year 783 after the building of Rome (or in the year 30 of our era). The first Passover-day of this year was a Friday.[4]

According to the statement of John, Jesus came six days before the Passover to Bethany. As the Passover began on the evening of the 14th Nisan, this statement points back to the 9th Nisan, to the Friday evening which preceded the last Sabbath before the feast. Probably on the Friday evening Jesus came with His followers into the region near the Mount of Olives. The desire to reach the neighbourhood of the holy city before the Sabbath, had probably furnished the inducement to travel the wearisome journey from Jericho through the desert as soon as the first morning hours of the day were past. The company dispersed on the Mount of Olives for the observance of the peaceful Sabbath-rest in their huts and tents; but Jesus had taken up His abode with His friends in Bethany.

The Sabbath was spent in tranquillity; but after sunset, or after the end of the Sabbath, His friends made ready for Him a feast in the house of Simon the leper. This is the same feast of which the disciples speak for the first time subsequently, because they wish to refer to it as the occasion of the treachery of Judas, to which they come later in the narrative.[5]

On the day after, scil., on the Sunday before the Good Friday, occurred the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, the so-called palm-procession (John xii. 12).

Between that Palm Sunday, which might be called the

[1] Wieseler, p. 335. Ebrard, *das Evang. Joh.* 43.

[2] The expression, πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς, John xiii. 1, plainly indicates the last transition from the eve of the festival to the festival itself, the time towards six o'clock on the evening of the 14th Nisan. It is apt to be forgotten that the preparations for the Passover, part of which was the slaughter of the lamb, fell on the 14th Nisan, whilst the Easter supper, which was partaken after sundown, belonged to the next day, the 15th Nisan. Then it is to be observed, that on the day of the crucifixion, Pilate said to the Jews that it was the custom, ἐν τῷ πάσχα, to release to them a prisoner, and that he offered at that time, scil., during the Passover, to release to them Jesus, who was bound.

[3] Above, vol. ii. p. 1.

[4] Wieseler, 176.

[5] Compare above, vol. iii. p. 92. Wieseler, 391.

typical Easter-day, and the actual Easter-day, or the real festal day of the palms of victory, every individual event of the last days of the life and the death of Jesus falls in consecutive order.[1] The principal circumstance of the following day, or the Monday, was the purification of the temple by Jesus once more, after He had cursed the fig-tree, which He had found without fruit on the road from Bethany to the city. In that purification He, as it were, made the temple itself the subject of His miracles of healing, among the children's shouts of hosanna, and the hostilities of the high priests and scribes. Thus this day represents the culminating point of His theocratic ministry in the ancient Israel, in the very centre of the Old Testament institutions (comp. Mark xi. 12–19).

On the other hand, on the Tuesday, occurs in that very temple the public separation between Jesus and the Jewish hierarchy. The observation of the disciples that the fig-tree which Jesus had cursed on the road-side, was withered away, most significantly leads up to this result. The first division of the transactions of Jesus with His enemies, consists in His repulse of their request that He should declare in what power or in what *name* He did His works, after they had refused to declare the prophetic dignity of John, with which His own historic acknowledgment was associated. In connection with this repulse He puts forth the parables, in which He vividly describes to them their offence against the Messiah. The second division of these transactions is seen in the victory of Christ over the temptations with which the several parties of His antagonists ranged themselves against Him, with a malicious pretence of homage. The third division comprises the denunciation of woe upon the Pharisees and scribes, and His formal departure from the temple itself, after He had there for the last time uttered His approval of the gift of the widow's mite (Matt. xxiv. 1; Mark xiii. 1; John xii. 37).

On the evening of the same day,[2] He is seated once more

[1] In the determination of the order we follow Wieseler's careful investigation.

[2] It may be doubted whether we are not to reckon the two days in such a way that this scene might occur on the Wednesday morning. But the Evangelists connect it very closely with the departure of Jesus from the temple; and Luke relates it, before he concludes his narrative of the

with several disciples on the Mount of Olives, over against the mount of the temple. He looks towards the temple, and predicts to them its downfall,—the judgment upon Jerusalem, and the judgment upon the world,—whilst in Jerusalem the high council is holding the session in which His death is resolved on. The time of this is strictly determined by the announcement of Jesus, in the midst of His disciples, that after two days would be the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 1, 2; Mark xiv. 1).

Jesus spends the Wednesday in a consecrated retirement, to which the Evangelist John clearly refers (xii. 36). Probably the Lord availed Himself of this retreat to prepare His larger band of disciples for His departure.

As the Thursday was the first day of unleavened bread, or the day of preparation for the feast, Jesus sent two of His disciples, Peter and John, in advance to the city with the charge to make ready the Passover. In the evening He followed them with the rest of the disciples, and sat down in their company to the celebration of the meal. This celebration found its highest development in the foot-washing and in the institution of the holy communion; and it was concluded with the deep and consolatory words of Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xii.; Luke xii. 7; John xiii.–xvii.).

Then came the great Friday, the day of Jesus' death (John xviii. 19).

The peaceful Sabbath, or Saturday, closes the holy week, as the day of Jesus' rest in the grave, which concludes the week of sorrow, and precedes the morning of the resurrection.

NOTE.

In this portion of the evangelic history it is more difficult to distribute the historical material in John than that in the Synoptists, with any degree of precision. Wieseler postpones the events which are related by John xii. 20-43, to the Tuesday, with reference to ch. xii. 36. First of all, we may perhaps assume that ver. 37 begins a statement, which may be considered as the retrospect of the Evangelist upon the public appearance of Jesus among the people, which now was over. In that case

appearance of Jesus in the temple, with a general retrospect (xxi. 37, 38). Moreover, according to John, it must be assumed that Jesus had once again for a short time withdrawn into absolute concealment.

the close of the 36th verse need not compel us to suppose that all that preceded, from ver. 20, is to be referred to the last day of His public ministry. The character of the closing transactions of Jesus with His enemies on the Tuesday, seems, moreover, to point to other situations besides that related by John, ver. 20. The announcement of the Greeks to the Lord belongs, perhaps, to the culminating point of His ministry among the people on the Monday; so also do His calm and solemn discourses with the people. The notice, moreover, of the peevish speech of the Pharisees points to that, ver. 19,—a moment which seems to correspond with the reproaches which the Pharisees, according to the Synoptists, uttered against the Lord on the Monday that He allowed Himself to be hailed by the hosannas of the children.

SECTION III.

THE BANQUET AT BETHANY, AND THE ANOINTING. THE BETRAYAL.

(Matt. xxvi. 6–16; Mark xiv. 3–11; Luke xxii. 1–6; John xii. 1–11.)

In the Old Testament arrangement of life, the work-days precede the rest-days; the holiday is earned, and is therefore only a lawful repose. In the New Testament arrangement, on the contrary, the Sundays precede the work-days, not only in the ordering of the church-life, but also variously in the way of inward self-direction. Certainly Sundays must also again follow the weeks of work; and, indeed, ever loftier and brighter in proportion as the labours have been more definite. Even to the Lord Himself was appointed a Sunday's repose for His refreshing and strengthening before His last great week's work. It was prepared for Him by the souls of disciples, in whom His Spirit had already begun effectually to operate as the living Spirit of Christianity. The first portion of this holy day was prepared

for Him by His friends in Bethany, probably on the evening of the last Saturday of His pilgrimage, which already belonged to the next Sunday. The second portion of this holy day was the festal entry into Jerusalem, which thousands of adorers prepared for Him. It was now to be manifest how the love of Christ triumphs; how it calls forth, in the midst of the old, cold, selfish world, a new one. In fair presages should appear to His soul the great Sunday of thankful, happy, as of sorrowful, sacrificing, and praising love, and of every Sunday-jubilee of the new covenant, as it should originate with His institution—and strengthen His soul to accomplish with stedfastness the last mournful journey.

In Bethany His friends made Him an evening entertainment. The two first Evangelists write with something of mystery, 'it was in the house of Simon the leper;' we have seen what might have led to this. But from the observation, that He had come to Bethany, where Lazarus dwelt, that there a banquet had been provided for Him, and that Martha had waited there, John allows us to conclude that the family of Lazarus was at least very much at home in that house, even although we attach no weight to the conjecture, that Martha perhaps had been a widow of that Simon.[1] The brother and sisters, to whom it had been appointed to prepare for the Lord the last friendly asylum in His pilgrimage on earth, evidently form the centre of this circle, and each one is effective in his degree. Martha finds her soul's delight in ministering to the Lord, and Lazarus could not contribute to His glorification more effectually than by sitting at the table among the guests, cheerful and in health, a blossom of resurrection which proclaims His Master as the Prince of Life. But just as Martha, by her ministry, causes the Lord to be acknowledged as the true Son of man, the traveller who has wandered far, who is weary, and in need of the festal refreshment,—and just as Lazarus glorifies Him as the mighty Prince of Life,—so Mary, with the ointment with which she adorns Him, celebrates His holy death, although as yet only with dim consciousness, yet with deep and foreboding sorrow.

Silently she steps forth with an alabaster casket in her

[1] [According to Ewald (401), Simon was the father of the family.—Ed.]

hand, which contains a pound[1] of genuine[2] ointment of spike-nard of high value, she advances to the Lord's place, breaks off the closed top of the casket,[3] and allows a portion of the ointment to flow over His head. Then she kneels down and anoints His feet also. Richly she applies the rich gift, as though she would withhold nothing. And as that great sinner had wiped the feet of Jesus with the hair of her head, so also did she. She rejoiced in this adornment of her head, which she obtained from the overflow of the ointment from His feet; for she felt what He was, what she owed to Him, and how ready she was to follow Him through suffering and death. John writes in lively, undying recollection—the whole house was full of the odour of the ointment.

Mary knew well in spirit what she was doing. She would and must fulfil this extraordinary work, and she knew that it would be pleasing to the Lord, yea, that it would afford Him a great refreshment. The expense seemed to her as nothing in respect of the importance of the moment. The offering entirely disappeared from her eyes when she considered the heavenly bliss of the grace that she had received, in the divine appointment, to show respect at this moment to that greatly misapprehended One, the faithful witness of God, with these unwonted, nay, royal honours. She held at this hour a deeply mysterious office, in the name of all angels and good spirits—of all elect souls of Christian humanity—yes, it may be said, by the most secret commission of the Father in heaven Himself, as in the loftiest consecration of the Holy Spirit, who made her the priestess to anoint the great High Priest for His death-journey. She anointed the Lord, with the presentiment of, as well as with the spiritual and divinely beautiful sympathy with, that death itself. Her action was entirely a prophetic one. She was conscious of what she did.

But how greatly must she have been amazed when she perceived that even the nobler members of the band of disciples

[1] See Friedlieb, *Archäologie der Leidensgeschichte*, p. 33. s. 33. The author conjectures that the litra here mentioned (the pound) is the old true litra of the Sicili-Greek system, about 7-20ths of a Cologne pound. ['Hardly as much as a Roman pound.'—Alford.]

[2] Upon the several interpretations of the expression, *νάρδος πιστική*, compare Lücke, ii. 493 [the substance of whose note is given by Alford], Sepp. iii. 175; Friedlieb, 30.

[3] Friedlieb, 33.

did not understand her, and that at one point of their circle a murmur of indignation had broken out which was gradually spreading, as if it would pervade the entire company, and by which, in any case, most of the disciples allowed themselves for a moment to become embarrassed to such a degree that they did not venture to take Mary immediately under their protection. John gives us an accurate explanation of the dark origin of this murmur in the band of disciples. It was Judas the son of Simon, the Iscariot, who first gave utterance to it: Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred denarii,[1] for the benefit of the poor? The calculating disciple thus ventured to characterize the inspired handmaid in this action as a thoughtless enthusiast. He threw out to her the reproach that she had deprived the poor of this costly benefit. Therefore, as was suitable to such a disposition, he rated the probable value of the ointment at its highest. But not only the Lord, even John also, seem to have looked through the hypocrite at that moment. He points out Judas as the man who was about eventually to betray the Lord, and remarks that he had thus expressed his indignation, not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, who administered the treasury of the disciples, and took possession of the contributions that flowed into it.

We gather from this observation, by the way, that the brotherhood of the Lord's disciples had a common treasury; that it received charitable contributions; that from these, moreover, it abundantly succoured the poor; so that it might rightly be said, that what was given to them was given to the poor. At the same time, we gather that Judas managed the treasury, and that even at this time he must have been guilty of embezzlement in respect of the same.[2] Perhaps since he had long been

[1] About L.9, 15s. [Some idea of the costliness of a μύρου ἀλάβαστρον is received from Herodotus numbering it among the gifts sent by Cambyses to the Ethiopians (iii. 20); also from Horace's 'nardi *parvus* onyx.'—ED.]

[2] Thus he had abused the pure and free community of goods of the disciples of Jesus, and his unfaithfulness serves as a mournful example which deters from a merely external and legal community of goods, just as the example of Ananias does. (Acts v.) Still more discouraging, indeed, is the arrogance that would impute to Mary, the lofty, beautiful, and free expenditure of her property as a wrong done to the society (considered by him in the most delusive sense *communist*), when he uttered the charge, 'This money *ought* to have been given to the poor.'

inwardly altogether out of harmony with the being, the spirit, and the course of life of his Master, he would have been able at this time to have 'gone off,' if this money had actually flowed into the treasury; for already he had arrived at a terrible darkening of his nature. The future of his Lord and Master, His life, His honour and glory, concern him no more; because, in his unhappy selfishness, he thought he saw his own future deeply imperilled by association with His interest. To anoint Christ with so costly an ointment, appeared to him therefore a sheer extravagance. And that powerful odour which streamed through the house as if it had been a king's hall, which broke forth thus out of the opening flower of the coming age as an entirely new fragrance,—an odour of life for those who were capable of life, —would seem to him a savour of death, an odour of corruption. No wonder if, in this bitter disposition, and confiding in the power of his dissimulation, he spoke vehemently. But it is remarkable that, in many of the disciples, the elements of affinity with the disposition of Judas should have gained the mastery over the elements of affinity with the disposition of Mary, even for a moment. We see also how fearfully the sinfulness of human nature reacted in the hearts of the disciples at this time, against the incipient glorification of Christ, the source of the regeneration of humanity. Mark relates that some of the disciples were angry at the transaction, had called it a waste, had valued it at three hundred denarii *and more*, and were filled with indignation against Mary. The anger among the disciples must have been strongly expressed. This is evident from the fact that Matthew, in his comprehensive manner, could say quite generally that the disciples were indignant. Scarcely could all the twelve have *expressed* such an indignation; but Matthew indicates that the disposition of the disciples was a general one, or rather, that they conceived a general offence, since even the best of them replied nothing to the wicked accusation. Mark, on the other hand, has perhaps painted in lively and clear colours their expression and their appearance, while John limits himself to their exact and actual motive. The difficulty in the minds of the disciples was, that they still thought too legally and meanly of the expenditure of the property, to be able to reconcile themselves to the princely spirit and style of Mary's homage; and thus the hypocritical anxiety of Judas for

the poor was able, for the first moment, to strike them more than the royal action of Mary had affected them. But the calculating chiliastic spirit of Judas, which at first probably had captivated the disciples, and subsequently had often paralyzed them, now carried them away with it for the last time in this mournful manner. Doubtless they availed themselves of the reproof of Jesus to their deep humiliation; while the traitor hardened himself even more against it, because he grudged to his Lord and Master this one outlay for His glorification.

We know not in what measure Mary was moved by the unexpected and lively censure of the company of disciples. She had with full confidence, out of the very depth of her heart, brought an offering of love to the Lord; and now the honourable college of disciples decided that she had done foolishly, yea lovelessly, and faithlessly towards the poor. Whilst the costly odour of the ointment filled the whole house, a very painful discontent was being diffused among the guests. She stood suddenly in the circle as one arraigned; and although her confidence did not forsake her for a moment, yet, in proportion as she had a presentiment of the death of Jesus, she must have perceived with a deep shudder the prevalence at that time, in the band of the disciples, of a satanic traitor-spirit.

The Lord had not yet expressed Himself; and before His tribunal stood His disciples in two parties, facing one another, eager and questioning. It was to be decided whether the Lord's world is really so poor, that it can give no offering of gratitude, no poetry and no extravagance of sacrificing love—no grand expression of great hearts, in splendid festivals, and gifts, and institutions, to the honour of God, to the glory of Jesus, to the celebration of the sublime moments of life; so poor, that the common necessity of every day, and the every day of common necessity, can and must, eventually, consume all the possessions of life. Surely the contradiction of such a notion is already found, in the very existence of these possessions at all. Somewhere and somehow, even the costly ointments will still be used; and thus, therefore, it is only a question whether they should be applied in an excellent manner for the service of consecrated moments, or in a common, luxurious, unspiritual waste. In the case of Judas, matters had really come to that issue, that so long as it was only sold for a good price, he would rather have

granted the ointment to an Eastern harem, than to the Lord for His festival. The Lord, however, does not let them wait in vain for His decisive word. With His perfect faith He received the faithful handmaid into protection. 'Let her alone,' said He; 'why trouble ye the woman? She hath wrought a good work on Me.' And this he explained to them. 'The poor have ye always with you; and if you really will, you can do them good: but Me ye have not always.' The occasion does not always occur when you can prepare for the Lord a festival of grateful love, either in His own person or in that of His people. The real festival-times are single moments, which the heart must recognise and embrace in their flight; for if they are lost, they are lost without recall. Thus it was with this occasion of refreshing the Lord on His last journey. Mary perceived the moment, and performed a work for which Christian humanity thanks her without ceasing. It is otherwise with the customary duty of the care of the poor. It does not intermit. For just as life, in its completeness, is constantly begetting sicknesses anew, so constantly anew it begets poverty. Certainly the relief of poverty ought always to be attempted as much as possible, and the more fundamental that relief the better. But the notion, that by the expenditure of large sums of money poverty can ever effectually be abolished, is a materialistic superstition. Commonly, however, this notion is entertained most by such as have themselves actually the least care for the poor, and do the least for them. The Lord counts it suspicious if such alternatives are suggested as these:—either to anoint Him or to care for the poor. This hypocritical alternative recurs a thousandfold in similar and kindred forms. In such cases the word of Christ can always be applied. If ye will, ye zealots for the interest of the poor, *yea, if ye will*, ye can always do good to the poor, for ye shall have them always with you. But the real poor, in their true necessities, do not so impoverish the world, as that the festive, the profound, the poetic heart, should be unable to declare itself in fit expression, yea, as that thankful love must not anoint its deliverer—for His death-journey.

The word of the Lord, especially spoken for Judas, might have another and a specially serious meaning. Poor men ye have always with you, but Me ye have not always. Judas had expressed the thought, that the poor would suffer by the expen-

diture on Jesus. Jesus intimates to him, that in future he will have no more to do with Him, but only with poor persons—that he will be always surrounded with the poorest poor: then it might be clear to him that the omission of the contribution of love does not cancel for him the necessity of the poor.

Then began the Lord to explain the action of Mary, according to its deepest meaning. He says that she had *kept* the ointment *for His burial.* From this expression we may perhaps conclude, that Mary had once deferred the anointing of the dead Lazarus, in her hope for the coming of Jesus, and was therefore placed in a position to apply the ointment now for Him. The dead brother she anointed no more, for she hoped still in the help of the Master; but Him she now anoints, while He is still alive, as if she would already inter Him. Thereupon the Lord declares with certainty, that she had been impelled to anoint Him, by a strong presentiment of His death and burial.

This word was especially fitted to pierce the conscience of the traitor; for he it was who was intending to prepare this death for his Master. Finally, Jesus declares the grandeur of this action of Mary in the affirmation, 'Verily I say unto you, Wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall it also be mentioned what this woman hath done, in remembrance of her.' He could not more strongly justify her. Her work should be commended to all time in connection with the preaching of the Gospel. It was thus asserted that the apostles, who had so bitterly blamed Mary on account of the anointing in that hour, were commissioned throughout the whole of their future life to bless and praise her for that very deed, in the face of their own generations, and generations to come. Yes, it was intimated to them, moreover, thereby, that with that record should be associated the remembrance of the terrible darkening, in that hour, of their love and faith, until the end of the world.

It is worthy of observation, that these supplementary words occur only in the two Evangelists who do not record the name of the woman, but not in John, who has preserved her name. It is as if the two first Evangelists had desired, by the record of this saying of Christ, to intimate to the reader of these Gospels,

that he might easily learn the name of the celebrated female disciple in the congregation of the Lord.

This incident, first of all, brought to maturity the thoughts of treason that were brooding in the soul of Judas. Luke takes notice, apparently, of a moment which forms the close of this scene, when Satan entered into Judas, who was yet one of the twelve, and he went away and communed with the chief priests and captains (the temple guard). The latter had it in charge to cast Jesus into prison, if they could discover his retreat. Thus Judas might betake himself to them, and give them to understand that he could deliver to them the man they sought. And thus he might be introduced to the chief priests. Or possibly also, the matter might have occurred thus: that Judas, first of all, treated with the chief priests, and might then have been made known by them to the officials of the temple police, because he must needs act in concert with them. Thus much is quite clear from Matthew, that at once, in the most shameless way, he turned his treachery to profitable account, with the question, 'What will ye give me, and I will deliver Him to you?' But they were glad, that out of the very band of disciples one should come to them with such an offer. Involuntarily they had conceived of the circle of the disciples of Jesus, as of an unshaken phalanx of His most faithful friends, nay, of a circle of inspired heroes of a new era. The discovery of such wickedness in this company, so near to the heart of Jesus, must even have surprised the old masters in sin, and have encouraged them immensely in their mischief. It is in the very nature of things, that the wicked and reprobate of the New Testament order of life, should be much worse, and more devilish, than those of the Old Testament. It may therefore be conceived how much the treachery of Judas must have encouraged the chief priests to the consummation of their work; while, on the other hand, probably the disciple also might stifle the last movements of his conscience with the illusion, that he was now being converted once more to the true old Judaism, and was on the praiseworthy road to deliver up to its jurisdiction one that was deserving of punishment. The enemies of Jesus thus received the false disciple joyfully, and arranged with him for a definite price, thirty shekels of silver,[1] exactly

[1] About L.3, 15s. See Friedlieb, 44.

the amount of blood-money payable for a slave whom an ox has slain.[1] The consideration of this hateful significance of the thirty pieces of silver might have been overlooked by the enemies of Jesus, or that they were purposing, in the most remarkable manner, to fulfil[2] the word of the prophet Zechariah concerning the thirty pieces of silver, at which the Lord was valued. In return, Judas gave them his promise (ἐξωμολόγησε). And thereupon he went out to find the fitting opportunity to deliver the Lord to His enemies. It was arranged in the matter, that it should be done with all quietness. The Pharisees already knew, from frequent experience, how difficult it was to get possession of the person of Him whom they sought in the midst of the people. Therefore they could only accept the offer of Judas, upon His promise to betray the Lord in one of His solitary hours. Thereupon he agreed, that in a sanctuary of His lonely prayer he would deliver up his Master to them.

It is very remarkable that the plans of Judas to betray the Lord were matured at two several times of festival,—namely, at the entertainment at Bethany, and at the celebration of the Passover in Jerusalem. This striking phenomenon is thus explained, that great influences of grace falling to the lot of false hearts, result in a mighty reaction of evil in them if they harden themselves, and they become terribly obdurate. In this manner Judas hardened himself at the two festivals, precisely on that account, because they exercised an extraordinary influence upon him, which might have startled and saved him. This is first apparent at the festival at Bethany. Here, above all things, the clear, pure, heavenly earnestness with which Mary glorified her Master, might have warmed his cold and empty heart. In vain! Her conduct offended him to the very depth of his soul. But

[1] Friedlieb, 36.

[2] De Wette observes (217): 'If the post-exile stater of the Treasury be meant, the sum was *unquestionably too little to furnish an explanation of the treachery of Judas, as proceeding from avarice.* But the tradition which the Evangelist follows has probably fixed the sum in accordance with the quotation from Zechariah.' We may here be reminded almost of the words of Zechariah: '*If ye think good, bring me my price (or make an offer), how much I am worth.*' Was not the avarice of Judas diabolical? Is it not possible to diabolical avarice to make the greatest sacrifice for the smallest price? For the rest, it must by all means be assumed that the avaricious man was also an ambitious man, and sought the favour of the chief council.

especially here, the fair festal joy increased his discomfort—the celebration of the glory of Jesus, his envy—the beautiful and princely liberality, his avarice—the gentle reproof of the Lord, his bitter enmity against Him—the heavenly clearness with which Jesus' glance pierced him through, his gloomy self-entanglement, in which he surrendered himself to the influences of Satan. Luke, as we have said, makes the remark here accordingly, that Satan entered into him. On the other hand, John associates that dark mystery with the moment when Judas at the last supper received the morsel from the hand of Jesus (John xiii. 27). But the same Evangelist notices expressly, in respect of the previous disposition of the soul of Judas at the beginning of the Passover, that the devil at that time had already put it into his heart to betray Jesus. Thus clearly does John distinguish two special moments in the hardening of Judas. This suggests to us a question as to the way in which the progressive steps in the hardening and the treachery of Judas stand related to one another.

On the evening of that supper at Bethany, when the Sabbath was already over, the traitor, under the cover of night, might have easily sought the neighbourhood of Jerusalem to enter into the first arrangements with the individual officers of the Sanhedrim. Moreover, that he actually did so, is almost more probable, than that in the early morning of the next day he should have hurried across the Mount of Olives on his dark errand; for his actual ways needed the curtain of night—the unseasonable time. On this occasion a general contract was effected between him and the chief priests. He gave them his word, that he would betray Jesus to them on the first opportunity. They, on their side, agreed upon the price to be paid to him for it. The time and the place were undecided, but it was arranged that the betrayal should take place out of the way of any popular disturbance. From this bargain, we may conclude that the first intention of Judas was matured. We say *his first intention*, but the final resolve did not come to maturity till immediately before the moment of the deed.

Probably the grand triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem occurred after the traitor had already concluded the first agreement with the enemies of the Lord. It may reasonably be supposed, in harmony with the whole character of this man, that

the palm-procession must, for a long time, have sadly staggered him. It might seem to him as if he had been mistaken, precipitate — that the prospects of Jesus were taking a more favourable turning, after all, than he had anticipated.

On such a supposition, it is explained that he did not avail himself of the evenings of Monday and Tuesday at all for the treason; although, if he had done so, he might have spared to the Sanhedrim the annoyance of being compelled to press forward the crucifixion even at the Passover. We find, accordingly, that two days before Easter the Sanhedrim held a sitting (probably late on Tuesday evening, and doubtless in consequence of the great triumph which Jesus had achieved on that day over all Jewish devices), in which they had not yet come to any answer to the question when Christ should be taken prisoner and put to death. The Sanhedrim has long since decided that Jesus should die; but they are now discussing how Christ might be apprehended secretly as well as craftily. It is evident that they hope for the assistance of Judas; but it is also evident, that since the first stipulation they cannot have had much communication with him, for the *how* still remains the great question for deliberation, and the conclusion is then come to, that the taking Him prisoner must now be postponed till after the feast.

But the departure of Jesus from the temple towards the evening of Tuesday, made it plain to Judas that the palm-procession would not be attended with any exaltation of his Master to the throne. If, on this supposition, his purpose had slightly wavered, the old intention is now again more than ever confirmed. And at length the celebration of the paschal supper brought about the crisis.

Up to that time he had been calculatingly playing with the purpose of Satan; but now that purpose played with him. In the first influence that Satan had exerted over him, he received the diabolical plan into his heart. He would gain for himself both favour and money from the Sanhedrim by the betrayal of his Master. But after that influence had operated a second time, he gave himself over as a slavish tool of the kingdom of darkness; as the bow and arrow with which the Prince of Darkness aimed at the heart of the Prince of Life. And now enslaved, he plunged, like one possessed, out into the night; and his

vehemence carried away with him even the leaders of the Sanhedrim to complete the work of darkness without delay.

NOTE.

The hypothesis, that Judas by his betrayal only wished to compel the Lord publicly to destroy His enemies, and to establish His kingdom, finds no support in the account of his life, unless the passage in Matt. xxvii. 3 be considered as affording such a support. The circumstance that twice in the course of one entertainment, in the midst of decidedly wholesome influences, Judas deliberately hardens his soul, convinces us of a deep alienation from, and even an embittering of his soul against, Jesus. Even the fact that he suffered himself to be paid for his treachery, does not permit us to think of a nobler motive. Moreover, it is to be taken into consideration, that Jesus would hardly have characterized so thoroughly absurd an attempt—which would have been more stupid than wicked—as the gravest crime. But, at all events, it is perhaps possible that the traitor—whose terrible self-entanglement will not so easily be cleared up, since, according to its nature, it is the most fearful chaotic soul-maze that the history of the world has known—may have benumbed his conscience, not only with the thought that he is now serving the highest established magistrates and priesthood, but also with the deceit that Jesus would know how to deliver Himself in time of need by His miraculous power. As his leading motive, however, we shall always have to consider an avarice and ambition exaggerated nearly to frenzy.

SECTION IV.

THE FESTAL ENTRY OF JESUS INTO JERUSALEM.

(Matt. xxi. 1–11; Mark xi. 1–11; Luke xix. 29–46; John xii. 9–18.)

It was at once known in Jerusalem, probably through the Passover pilgrims, that Jesus had arrived at Bethany. In consequence, great crowds wandered out towards that place, not only to see Jesus, but Lazarus also, whom He had raised from the

dead. This outward movement probably occurred before the beginning of the Sabbath, towards Friday evening, or else, at the latest, as the Sabbath drew to a close.[1] There might be many who made an exception to the rule of resting on the Sabbath; for it was not the strict Jews, but the more liberal ones, who went in quest of the Lord. Thus perhaps the Sabbath holiday, on that rest-day of Jesus, was greatly enlivened. Many of those guests who saw the newly living man by the side of the Prince of Life, returned again to Jerusalem in the evening, believing. Probably, moreover, the high priests on the same day, after the close of the Sabbath, held the council at which the dubious suggestion was expressed, whether Lazarus also must not be put to death. He was a lively offence to them, because he was a lively memorial of the glory of Jesus.

The road which led out of the valley from Bethany and over the hill-top from Bethphage,[2] up towards the middle summit of the Mount of Olives, descending then towards the valley of Kidron, which separates the heights of Jerusalem from the summit of the Mount of Olives,[3] raised as it is four hundred feet above the bed of the Kidron, winds through rich plantations of palm-trees, and fruit and olive gardens. If we were to name the localities in English, we should say that the road led from Datetown across Figtown, towards the Mount of Olive plantations.[4]

[1] 'It was only lawful to go a thousand paces on the Sabbath; but Bethany was twice as far as that from Jerusalem. In such a case, it was customary so to contrive as that the first thousand paces might be taken before sunset on the Sabbath, when there would remain only the other half to be gone.'—Neander, 390.

[2] Schubert, ii. 571. Compare Robinson, i. 431. [Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, 188.]

[3] 'The height of Moriah amounts to 2280 Par. feet; that of the hill of Sion, at the Cœnaculum, 2381; at the Latin Convent, 2457; at the Church of the Ascension, 2530; and of the summit of the Mount of Olives, 2556. The bed of the Kidron lies about 416 feet lower down, at a level of 2140 feet.'—Schubert, ii. 521. [The proportion of the English foot to the French is as 15 to 16.—Ed.]

[4] When it is mentioned that Bethphage (בֵּית פַּגֵּא) means house of figs, the explanation of the name of Bethany by house of dates (בֵּית הִינֵי, Talm. אה־נה) might perhaps seem preferable to the other interpretations, since it often happens that the names of two adjacent places have some relation to one another. Another derivation suggests the translation of Bethany by house of the valley, or nether-house (בֵּית עניה).—Friedlieb, 5.

In the Passover time, moreover, this road, by reason of the many companies of pilgrims, and the encampments on the declivity of the Mount of Olives,[1] might be likened to a camp aroused for festivity. On Saturday evening, and early on Sunday morning, this road was still more enlivened by the troops of pilgrims who were returning home to Jerusalem, and carried thither the intelligence that Jesus was coming on the morrow to the city. All the worshippers of Jesus were excessively elated by this news, and, without concert or premeditation, it happened that soon a still larger festal procession was formed to go out to meet Him. The powerful presentiment of the New Testament age was the living spirit which, so to speak, improvised this reception. The great hope that Jesus would now make His entry among His people as the Messiah, prepared this triumph for Him.

Even at His first departure from the house of His friends at Bethany, Passover pilgrims met the Lord bearing in their hands branches of palm-trees, and singing the words of a psalm which may be considered as the peculiar Messianic hymn. Hosanna! (God's salvation be near[2]), 'Blessed be Thou who comest in the name of the Lord, Thou King of Israel!' Thus they sang an old song in a new sense, with new festal rapture. For centuries the elect in Israel had mused in spirit on the hymn with which they would greet the Messiah, and had sought to devise in their soul the kind of song for the purpose. Now they found that an old preluding prophetic strain of a psalm (Ps. cxviii. 26) had been given them for this very celebration.

Thus, as they hailed the Lord with a Messianic psalm, so He seemed ready to answer them at once with a Messianic sign. He would make His entry into the holy city in the character of the King of Peace, as the prophet Zechariah had described Him (chap. ix. 9). The prophet had depicted the King bringing salvation, as He comes to His city, not upon a war-horse, but on the beast of burden of peaceful intercourse, lowly and gentle, and

[1] Many pilgrims dwelt during the feast in tents outside the city. This was allowed on condition that they placed the tents within the circumference of the Sabbath-day's journey (not above 1000 paces from the city). Besides, they were bound to pass the first night of the feast within the city. —Sepp. iii. 59.

[2] The expression, הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא (יְהוָה), Jehovah, help! is perhaps the Messianic Hail! or, Good luck! bearing many significations, according to the occasion, in this case unfolding its highest significance.

as if announcing therewith a new era of peace. Jesus felt with certainty that this moment had now come, and He found that it was now His duty to manifest Himself to His people in the form in which the prophet had proclaimed Him. Thus it was not perhaps His care to fulfil in an external manner a prophetic Scripture word, but to respond to a theocratic expectation,—to fulfil a theocratic law and symbol,—and therein to satisfy the will of God, which assuredly was altogether in harmony with the exigencies of the moment. For as regards the latter, it could not be at all fitting that the hero of a festal procession should be lost among the crowd of foot-passengers; He must, in one way or another, be made prominent. But how could He more unassumingly form the prominent centre of the procession than by riding upon an ass? Thus, at this point also in the life of Jesus, the requirement of the moment corresponded with the requirement of eternity.

But here also the Lord obtains the means needful for the occasion, in the simplest and most suitable manner. Just as the march had begun, He sent forward two disciples (who are not more accurately identified), to provide for Him a beast to ride on the way. The testimony of the Evangelist Mark must inform us of the meaning of the specification of places which is given here both by Matthew and Luke. They drew near, it is said, to the places Jerusalem, Bethphage, and Bethany. According to the position of those stations, it is plain that the Evangelist first mentions the exact end of the journey, and that from that he enumerates the intervening stations. Hence they are thus on the point of coming to Bethany, then to Bethphage, and lastly to Jerusalem.[1] But how can it be said that they had approached to Bethany, Bethphage, and Jerusalem, when, nevertheless, they came out from Bethany? This assertion must be explained entirely by the local relations of Bethany; and by reference to them it *is* easily explained, if we suppose, for instance, that it was a scattered town, and that the lodging of Jesus was in one of the houses at the eastern extremity of the town.[2] If, now, from this place as the beginning of the

[1] Robinson draws also a false conclusion from Matt. xxi. 1, Luke xix. 29, when he supposes that Jesus came first to Bethphage, then to Bethany, i. 433.

[2] From the expression referred to, it in no wise follows, as Strauss sup-

journey, Jesus sent forth the disciples to the next town, by that must certainly be meant Bethphage, especially if the Evangelist Matthew in particular be considered.

Jesus said beforehand to these disciples, that just at the entrance of the town they would find a she-ass tied, and a foal with it. These animals He bade them loose, and bring to Him. But if any one should ask them, Wherefore do ye that? they were to answer them, The Lord hath need of them; then he would at once let them go. It is perhaps evident that the accurate directions of the Lord in this place almost present the appearance of a statement of appointed words; and this would lead us to conceive of a concerted arrangement which might have been come to at an earlier date, between Him and confidential friends in Bethphage.[1] Even the connection in no wise compels us to see in the occurrence an absolutely direct prediction of Jesus. But, on the other hand, a *precise agreement* would hardly have taken this mysterious form, which might so easily be misunderstood, nay, so easily evaded. Thus much may with certainty be supposed, *that the proprietor* of these animals belonged to the faithful followers of Jesus. Further, perhaps it may be conjectured that he might once have declared that he would wish to render to the Lord a service of this kind at His festal entry into the holy city. But the particulars might have remained entrusted to the occasion, and to the wondrous insight of Jesus. He, however, saw clearly in the Spirit how the disposition of His friends was now excited, and how He now might reckon on the devotion of that family in Bethphage. He certainly knew, therefore, that even this remarkable blossom of that disposition must have now ripened.

But how comes it that Matthew speaks of an ass and of a colt belonging to her, whilst the other Evangelists only know of the foal. Strauss explains this circumstance by the supposition, that Matthew had misunderstood the passage in the prophet Zechariah—that from the parallelism of the sentence which

poses (ii. 268), that the three first Evangelists represent Jesus as going forth directly from Jericho; just as little, as Schleiermacher assumes (*Lukas*, 244), that the Evangelists represented two public separate entries into Jerusalem.

[1] Compare Neander, *in loc.*

speaks of an ass, the foal of an ass, he has made two animals, and modified the history accordingly. But the Evangelist, who, doubtless, understood the poetic parallelism of the Hebrews, had in view another parallelism—*that*, namely, between the dam and the foal as it *actually* appeared in the history of that procession. No doubt the prophet had represented the beast on which Jesus rode as an ass's foal. The Evangelists lay stress upon it, that Jesus has made His entry upon a foal never yet ridden. The character of the animal must be symbolical, because the entire palm-procession formed a symbol. An altogether *new era*, a *new Prince*, a *new* animal to ride on.[1] But as this foal had never yet carried a rider, it followed, therefore, in order that it might be somewhat tamed and quieted for its first service, that the dam should be led by its side.[2] Thus Matthew was guided by the parallelism of facts in conformity with his accuracy in special details, whilst the other Evangelists merely mentioned the foal which bore the Lord, which, after all, was the substantial thing.

If criticism asks wherefore Christ ventured to ride an unbroken animal, we are reminded of certain riders who consider it perilous work to mount a mettlesome beast; perhaps, also, of that parson in Jean Paul, who believed that his horse, when quietly trotting along, was running away with him frightfully. And if he is really uneasy on this account, about the dignified Rider and about the young ass—under the impression that it is unseemly to mount an animal not yet broken, young, unweaned—he forgets that there is a period in the life of such an ass,[3] when for the first time he is ridden without risk for him or for his rider, and that, according to the intimation of the Evangelists, this period had just arrived for this colt; and, moreover, as it appears very soon, that he was actually passing through it.

The Evangelist Matthew, in his reflective manner, refers in the narrative of this event to the word of the prophet Zechariah. He appeals to it freely with the words: 'All this happened that the word of the prophet might be fulfilled, which says, Say unto

[1] According to Justin Martyr (*Trypho.* c. 53), the colt was a figure of unrestrained heathenism; the ass, accustomed to the burden, a figure of heathenism subjected to the yoke of the law. Even Dr Paulus acknowledges this symbolism. Compare thereupon, Strauss, ii. 277.

[2] Ebrard, 372.

the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, riding upon an ass, and (indeed[1]) on a colt the foal of the burden-bearing ass.' John also reminds us that this place of the prophet was then in process of fulfilment, and remarks thereupon, that the disciples, during the procession itself, had not thought on this reference, but that it was first disclosed to them after the glorification of Jesus.

The two disciples went forward and found the beast standing in the street of the village, tied beside a door. The owners of the beast, observant men, stood close by. The disciples must decide before the eyes of the bystanders (whom they do not appear to have known as being likewise disciples of Jesus) upon a proceeding which had the appearance of violence; and which yet was not violence, since the Spirit of their Lord was certain of the spirit of those men, and had communicated the certainty to their spirit. Thus without further delay they loosed the animals. Those who stood by came forward with the question, Wherefore they loosed the colt (with the mother)? They gave the appointed answer, 'The Lord hath need of them.' The mysterious answer satisfied the mysterious questioners. In fact, it cannot be without purpose that Jesus chose precisely this form of words for obtaining an animal to ride on which He needed. He therein expressed the character of the progress of His kingdom throughout the world. He is a King who keeps no royal stable at any appointed place of exit for Himself or for His people. But when He needs it, when His work needs it, there are always waiting secret friends at the door—those who gladly hear the word. The elected ones of Him or of His people —these are the ministering spirits at hand: and even the needed beasts on which to ride stand on the way to His order.[2] And in this confidence His people ought to proceed; and when they are certain of the spirit of men turned to the Lord, then they ought not to reject their help, but to avail themselves of it in

[1] The words of the prophet (ix. 9) declare, 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion; and shout, O daughter, of Jerusalem: behold, thy King shall come to thee, just, endowed with salvation and victory, poor (in appearance), and riding upon an ass, on a foal of the she-ass.'

[2] Even here Strauss appears utterly unconscious of the religious importance of this passage. The narrative, according to him, was intended to furnish a proof of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus, and of the magic power of His name (ii. 280).

the simple, humble, and frank manner of their Lord. The Lord hath need of them! A singular expression. At that moment, when the King of kings needs an ass's colt, then it can and must not fail Him. Thus He walked on earth as one having nothing, and yet possessing all things; and to such a walk He is here educating all His disciples.[1]

The disciples brought the animals and led them to the Lord. They also were filled with the general excitement—they spread their garments for a covering upon the beast, and Jesus mounted and rode thereon.[2]

The people also now began to express their joy in a more and more lively manner. Many strewed their garments in the way, others pulled branches from the trees and strewed them on the path of Jesus. Thus these made for Him a festal march, whilst others, going before and following Him, arranged themselves into choirs, and with loud voice sang the hosanna psalm. With a loud hosanna Jesus was proclaimed the Son of David. With a loud hosanna it was announced that now the kingdom of His father David is returning, and now is beginning the Messianic kingdom. Yes, even a hosanna was carried to the dwellers in heaven.[3]

This jubilee reached its height when the triumphal procession had attained the summit of the Mount of Olives; and at once the holy city, spread out on the opposite heights below, unfolded all its glory before them.[4] And now His disciples began to glorify God in songs of praise, and to celebrate the wonderful works that Jesus had done.[5] Possibly, indeed, this was the prelude of their acclamations at Pentecost, when also they declared the great acts of God (in the miracles of Jesus). But especially, according to John, they praised His latest, grandest work of wonder—the raising of Lazarus; and the rather, that this work was the strongest inducement which had led the people forth to meet Him.[6] This unbounded, energetic, and

[1] Compare 2 Cor. vi. 10.

[2] On the *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν*, *vide* Winer, *N. T. Gram.*

[3] Mark xi. 10. Upon similar festival processions, see Tholuck, 291; Sepp. iii. 186.

[4] The view from the Mount of Olives over the city of Jerusalem is praised even still as most imposing. Similar to this recognition of the holy city was the jubilee with which the first Crusaders caught sight of it.

[5] Luke xix. 37. [6] John xii. 17, 18.

public devotion appears to have driven to despair some Pharisees who had mingled with the procession, perhaps as spectators. They were so completely bewildered, that they at once approached Jesus, and called upon Him to rebuke His disciples. It is plain that they drew His attention to the dangerous consequences of such a public gathering, and they wished to make Him responsible for them.

But the Lord knew what was the divine right and what were the privileges of humanity, and would not check them. He knew that this celebration was no encroachment upon the right of the world, neither of the Roman supremacy nor of the Jewish priesthood; that it was every way due to Him and to the people. He knew that this festival belonged to His people's freedom of faith and worship; yea, that it was the last beautiful grand act of His people's theocratic national liberty, which, in its spirituality and heavenly nature, superseded the Roman claim. In this sense He answered, 'I say unto you, If these should hold their peace, the stones would soon begin to cry out.' Perhaps the loud songs of praise echoed on the rocky walls of the opposite temple-mountain, of the temple itself, and of the palaces of Zion; and the perception of this might have given the external occasion for the grand word of Jesus. But the actual meaning of this word was a terrible prophecy. When it has come to that point, that these crowds are silent from the praise of their King, then shall those stones opposite to you echo of His praise with their cry. Those who were learned in the Scriptures might know what Jesus meant by the word, The stones shall begin to cry out; for they knew the word of the prophet Habakkuk (ii. 11), 'For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it,' with which he had threatened the destruction of the blood-built city—of the violent tyrant of the city of Babylon. They must thus be thoroughly aware that Jesus foreboded a great judgment of destruction, which should be the consequence if His worshippers should forcibly be put to silence—that Jerusalem would thereupon be laid waste, like a second Babylon.[1] And therein He expressed a great law of life of the kingdom of God. If men refrain from uttering the praise of God, and especially if a gloomy disposition imposes upon the better men such a silence, if the

[1] Stier, iv. 329.

Gospel is suppressed, then the stones begin to cry out. Stones of down-falling temples, of bursting citadel walls, of falling towns—stones of torn-up pavements—these announce the judgments of God, whose glory can have no end. For God's majesty must continually be traversing the earth in some festal procession—either in angels of grace or in angels of judgment—either in spring days and summer joys of the Spirit's life and its fair edifices, or in autumn and winter storms of ruin.[1] This is specially true of the honour of Christ. He must be praised even to the end. For since humanity is inalienably connected with Him as the Head, so from all great realizations of this connection must proceed Hosanna festivals—from all great disturbances of the same, times of judgment.

This, then, it was that occupied the soul of Jesus at this time, amid the loudest jubilee of those around Him. But now when, on descending from the summit of the Mount of Olives, His eyes rested on the city, He burst at once into tears over it, and uttered a lament—words which, as if moistened with tears, appear to be checked by the interruptions of the weeping voice: 'If thou hadst known, even thou (so soon to incur judgment as those great cities of the heathen, even now, late, terribly late, as it is), in this thy day (even now in this day, which, according to thine ideal destiny, should be the day of thy world-historic bridal), the things which belong unto thy peace.' He does not declare what course Jerusalem might then adopt for its salvation—what judgments, what centuries of calamity, might then be spared her; but after a sad pause, in prophetic awe of spirit, He adds, 'but now they are hid from thine eyes.' That is to say, The doom is already decreed; thou hast incurred it, that thy salvation, as well as thy ruin, is hidden from thee. And now He declares the coming judgments: 'For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

Thus also the Lord spake in the language of the spirit of insight, even as His companions did. His lamentations mingled with their jubilee and song of praise. If at any time among

[1] Stier, iv. 331.

those who surrounded Him, any spirit of carnal excitement or of sedition might have been sought to be roused, assuredly this penetrating wail of the love of Christ over the holy city would have allayed and expelled it. Gradually, perhaps, the waves of jubilee would partially subside as the procession descended lower; and in the valley of Kidron, defiled past the garden of Gethsemane, who knows what forebodings of the cross, what anticipation of the holy death-sorrow of a later time, might be suggested to the nobler spirits among them in the valley of Kidron? Nevertheless, in general, the glad festal voice continued: for hardly could those who were at a distance from the Lord, either spiritually or bodily, understand His suffering; and His own serenity soon cheered up again even those who understood Him best. Thus the festal pilgrimage went on, so large and important that at their entrance into Jerusalem the whole city was moved. It was at once seen everywhere that this procession concerned some individual highly celebrated. Hence the question, 'Who is this?' and many perhaps might ask it in doubt and indignation, offended and irritated. The crowds answered, 'This is Jesus, the Prophet of Nazareth in Galilee.' It was as if the first chilling breeze had already blown upon them in the city, and lowered the tone of their acknowledgment.

But Jesus passed through the city in the direct way towards the temple. And in the temple He now made His appearance as King and High Priest, according to theocratic right. In this capacity He went around, and cast His eyes upon all things (*περιβλεψάμενος πάντα*[1]). It was as in a symbolic and real church visitation that he thus inspected everything. Silently and penetratingly He took in everything in His glance,—everywhere discerning spiritual death under the glistening curtain of life, the completest ruin in the apparent bloom of living worship: everywhere complete heathenism upon Moriah. Thus He went

[1] Tholuck follows Strauss (280) in supposing, without foundation, that Mark does not make the procession reach the city till late. The observation assumed to be made by Ebrard, according to which *ὀψίας*, etc., should be referred to *ἐξῆλθεν*, is well founded. The entire narrative perhaps at least suggests to us that the procession descended the declivity of the Mount of Olives while it was yet broad daylight. But then it was already near to the gates of the city. Certainly the union of the participial form, *περιβλεψάμενος*, with this statement proves that, upon the whole, it was too late for Jesus to have intended anything more than the 'look round.'

around, and perceived everything with clear glance and deep silence in His true heart. He had not completed this work until late in the evening.

The great Palm-Sunday was over. In the little company of the twelve, Jesus returned to Bethany through the approaching night. In the Spirit He had beheld the holiday times which the new humanity would owe to Him, and had rejoiced with them. But in the Spirit He had also beheld the judgments which impended over the city, and had been compelled openly to bewail them on his own day of honour. He had heard the speech of the destroyers of the *Sunday* and *holiday* already proclaimed by the fathers for His city and His people—had perhaps seen them look out of the windows of the palaces of Jerusalem with the mocking question, Who is this? And He had seen them steal about in the temple with such recollections and with the deepest presentiments of joy and sorrow. He returned over the dark Mount of Olives. Judas also walked near Him among the twelve. But the sadness and the seriousness of the evening could not deprive the Lord of the blessedness which the Father had appointed for Him on His Sunday. Even His tears themselves had been tears of love and of intercession shed in the deep and heavenly peace of a pure sympathy, and they were wept into the bosom of the Father. Thus His Sunday had strengthened Him for the great work of the week.

SECTION V.

THE SINGLE DAY OF THE MESSIANIC ABODE AND ADMINISTRATION OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE. ESPECIALLY THE CURSING OF THE FIG-TREE. THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE. THE CONSECRATION OF THE TEMPLE. THE EXERCISE OF THE TEACHER'S OFFICE, AND THE MIRACLES OF HEALING IN THE TEMPLE. THE HOSANNA OF THE CHILDREN. THE INDIGNATION OF THE PHARISEES, AND ITS REBUKE. THE GREEKS, AND THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN.

(Matt. xxi. 12–22; Mark xi. 12–19; Luke xix. 45–48; John xii. 19–36.)

The prophet Malachi had once announced the coming of the Messiah with the words, 'The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts' (Mal. iii. 1). These words were fulfilled in a manifold manner in the entire first appearance of Christ, and were to be fulfilled once again at the revelation of His glory. But once they were accomplished in the most literal sense—*now*, for instance, when Jesus, greeted by His people as Messiah, made His festal entry into the temple.

He now made His theocratic residence in the temple, when, on the day after His entry into the city of Jerusalem, He purified the temple, and then, amidst the hosanna-shout of the children, began a great ministry in the temple. But this glory of His free abode and rule in the temple only lasted one day—the Monday of the passion week. If, however, we reckon in addition the entry on the Sunday previously, and His departure from the temple on the subsequent Tuesday, this residence lasted three days.

On the morning of this particular day, Jesus seems, with a truly child-like and buoyant eagerness, to have left Bethany for the purpose of hastening to His abode and ministry in the house which was His Father's. In the deep attraction of His heart towards the midst of His people, He has not thought at all of appeasing His bodily necessities with a morning meal. Thus He was scarcely on His way to the city when the sense of hunger was felt by Him. Probably He became conscious of it

at first through the glimpse of the many-leaved fig-tree of much promise which He observed from far.[1] He advanced to the tree, sought some fruit, and found only leaves. The tree appeared in symbolical language to say to Him, The time of fruit is not come. Thus Jesus understood it; therefore His word upon it was an answer directed to it (Mark xi. 14), 'No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever.'[2]

This word allows us to cast a glimpse into the mind of the Lord. The leafy fruitless tree in the way became to Him immediately a symbol of the existing Israel. The deep yet latent curse of the people and country appeared to His soul in this sign of the misgrowth of a tree on the way; therefore in this place He will through His word reveal the hidden curse. He will use the tree for a sign that the judgments of God are on the way to break forth out of the depth of the Israelitish people's life, in order to spoil even its appearance. With this sign He announces warningly His future judicial mission.

We have already seen above how vain are the forest laws of those critics who would wish to compare the word which cursed the tree, to a felling axe. Moreover, it may be observed that Christ, in virtue of the devotion of the people yesterday, was to-day a theocratic King in the land, and that probably that tree belonged to the public property of the temple or the city.

The disciples heard and retained the remarkable word which Jesus had spoken upon the unfruitful tree.

Since the first public visit of Jesus to the temple, at which He had cleansed the fore-court of the sanctuary from the buyers and sellers; the old disorder had by degrees returned. To-day, however, the Lord must see the temple once more pure, for to-day it was *His* house. It was appointed to Him of the Father to establish His residence for this one day in the temple. But this time He performed the purification still more rigorously than at the first time, publicly giving as a reason that the Lord's house is appointed for a house of prayer for all people.[3]

[1] [The tree stood alone, and would attract the eye; συκῆν μίαν. Matt. xxi. 19.—Ed.]

[2] See above, vol. ii. p. 150, and compare Ebrard, p. 373.

[3] 'In Isa. lvi. 7, it is added that the heathen should worship at Jerusalem, and the special court in which the proselytes might perform their worship was the scene of the abomination which the priesthood had suffered,

As soon as He had made room for Himself in this way, He began His day's work. Those who were in need of help now sought for Him in the temple itself; the blind and lame, for instance; and He healed them. Miracles of healing in the midst of the fore-court, before the eyes of the priesthood and all the people! Nothing ought to have startled the priesthood more than this, but nothing *provoked* them more. They looked upon it as if the Man of Nazareth were now transferring His new, strange, and to them hateful, worship into their very temple. In addition, the amazement of the people was ever increasing; so much, that the youngest pilgrims of the festival—the children in the temple[1]—cried to Him their hosanna. This hosanna, which glorified the Lord as the Messiah, even in the court of the temple, appeared to them intolerable. They thought that it must be too much even for Himself. 'Hearest Thou what these say?' they asked Him, with tokens of the greatest astonishment. 'Yea!' the Lord answered them, with the expression of the most peaceful assurance, which He opposed to their hypocritical excitement. Then He addressed to them the counter-question, 'Have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings (untrained) Thou hast perfected praise?'

He left it to themselves to make the addition, according to the well-known text of the eighth Psalm (ver. 2), 'because of Thine enemies, that Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.' God often prepares for Himself praise out of the mouth of babes and children scarcely born, in opposition to old and grown-up people who dishonour His name: out of the mouth of a new and more pious generation, which is not yet trained, and without office or dignity, in opposition to the fathers of a generation dying out, who are called by official position to spread abroad His glory; but who, above all others, offer resistance to it. And if this was ever the case, it was so here. Jesus,

and by which the heathen were deterred from the true service of God.'—Rauschenbusch, *Leben Jesu*, 309.

[1] By the children in the temple, Sepp thinks (iii. 192), in accordance with his ecclesiastical view, should be understood girls and boys consecrated to the temple service. The fact is well assured, that there were such boys and girls in the service of the temple; but it does not therefore follow that they are spoken of here. Rather the usual dependence of such temple associates on the spirit of the priesthood makes this supposition improbable.

moreover, says to them, that this glory is prepared for Him by God, and is prepared *in* Him for His Father. He then designates those children, whom they would regard as wicked and heretical disturbers of the peace, as a choir of those unconscious prophets of God, who are appointed to surround with exultation the standard of His kingdom, in the evil days when the external dignitaries of this kingdom are changed into adversaries.[1] He left it to His enemies to recognise themselves as adversaries of the honour of God, even in the mirror of the eighth Psalm.[2]

The Evangelist John has perhaps especially had in mind the chief characteristics of this day, when he relates that the Pharisees spoke among themselves helplessly, and in doubt cried to one another, 'Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the whole world is gone after Him.'

In the main they were right. The children who hailed the Lord represented the generations of a believing posterity. But even the peoples, on this day of honour, were to do homage to Him in their chosen representatives, just as formerly in the cradle the wise men from the east brought to Him from the heathen world the first joyous greeting upon His advent.

About this time, accordingly, some Greeks who had come to the feast to worship, sought to present themselves to the Lord. They were plainly Jewish proselytes, in a general sense, kindred in faith of the Jews, participating in the fundamental doctrines of the kingdom of God; but not such as had allowed themselves to be incorporated into the Jewish nation by circumcision. For if they had been ordinary heathens, they would not have come to the feast in Jerusalem as worshippers; as Judaized heathens, on the other hand, they could no longer have represented the heathen world to the Lord.[3]

These men went with their wish, first of all, to Philip of

[1] Compare the song of Luther, 'Of the Two Martyrs of Christ at Brussels.'

[2] As to the Messianic character of the eighth Psalm there is no question in this place; for here the reference is to a theocratic fundamental law, which is often repeated in the kingdom of God, but certainly in the most eminent sense in the life of Christ.

[3] Even John appears, in xii. 19, 20, to take the idea of Greeks in its usual narrow meaning. Lücke, 515. Sepp brings forward the hypothesis, that these Greeks were the deputies of Abgarus the king of Edessa, whom, according to Eusebius, he must have sent to Christ.

Bethsaida in Galilee. Perhaps their turning first to him depended upon a law of kindly attraction. Their suit is a pressing and respectful entreaty — 'Sir, we would see Jesus!' Philip tells Andrew, whom his name likewise seems to characterize as a Phil-hellenist;[1] and hereupon they both agreed to bring the wish of the Greeks before the Lord. It almost looks as if a court ceremonial had been arranged around the King on Zion on this day. But this wondrous etiquette is only a subtle heavenly pattern of the spirit of reverence in its reciprocal action with the spirit of confidence. To Philip alone it might seem too bold to introduce to Jesus Greek strangers, who, perhaps, in the estimation of the temple-frequenters, were classed among the lowest of the worshippers. But the spirit of confidence and of joy at this respect, which already animated himself, was responded to also out of the heart of Andrew, and thus they ventured on the announcement.

But Jesus comprehended, in the depth of His nature, the significance of this moment. Yea, the moment affected Him so powerfully, as to stir up His whole nature throughout. At once it was plain to Him, that in this announcement of the Greeks a great sign was given to Him from the Father, a sign of His incipient glorification among the Gentiles; and therefore also a sign of His death, as that must precede His glorification; a sign of His approaching death, and therefore also of the glory proceeding from it. With solemn earnestness He gave to the two disciples for an answer, 'The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified.' It was the joyous certainty with which He would sanction the joy that appeared in their countenance, at the reverence of heathen strangers for Him. But He must now impress on their heart what they could not forbode: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' We have here a threefold consideration: first, the importance of the word generally; then its relation to the announcement of this first fruits of the Gentiles; lastly, the meaning that it derives from the fact of its being spoken at the first historic meeting of the Spirit of Christ with the spirit of the Greeks!

As to the general sense of the word, Jesus declares a funda-

[1] It is worthy of remark, that, according to tradition, Philip must have laboured in Phrygia; Andrew in Asia Minor, Thrace, and Greece.

mental law of the kingdom of God which is prefigured by a fundamental law in the kingdom of nature; and finds in the history of the corn of wheat, its purest, noblest typical expression. A single living corn of wheat remains, as such, a poor grain—alone, isolated, at best a little meal—no bread, much less then the beginning of a rich harvest. If any advantage is to accrue from the single grain of wheat, it must fall into the earth, be buried, and disappear; it must then begin to rot, and altogether seem to perish. Then it attains, out of its innermost core, its true life, at the moment when it seems to have approached nearly to its dissolution. In the corruption of its substance is the heart of its life, its innermost creatively-imparted productive nature, overpowering death; truly living, it germinates and grows green, it blooms and ripens, and brings forth much fruit. Yes, in this way it may cover the fields with golden wheat, sustain and replenish the world with its fruit. This law of the corn of wheat declares, first of all, the fundamental law of nature, that out of death, or rather out of the husk of death, and the closest neighbourhood of death, it attains its renovation and increase. Thus, in the depth of death, every plant attains its renovation and increase; thus, out of the grave of winter the earth attains its spring; thus, out of the floods or out of the flames of an apparent destruction, the world attains its renewal. But besides this fundamental law, it is moreover declared that the life must always return to God, even to disappearance in Him, if it is to go forth richer from God.[1] Moreover, this fundamental law is thus referred to the spiritual region, that only from a priestly sacrifice to God is the royal life won, out of God and from God.

If, then, in its most general form, this law strictly prevails throughout the whole of God's world, it must needs attain enhanced expression in this earthly world, where death is the wages of sin. Here, the sacrifice to God must be sealed in death, even the sacrifice of Christ, because He has incorporated Himself into this race, and will lead back this race out of death into life. When the butterfly goes forth from its transformation out of the torpid state of the caterpillar, so near and so like to death, it is an image of the renovation of life as it may occur in unfallen planets, and as it might have occurred on the earth if

[1] Ps. civ. 29, 30.

Adam had not fallen. But when the corn of wheat dies and becomes alive again, and brings forth much fruit, it is an image of the sadder transit through the deep of death, which sin has made necessary upon earth; of the death of the cross, out of which Christ goes forth with the harvest of salvation for the world; and of the self-sacrifice even to death, through which His people must die with Him, in order to penetrate to the true riches of the new life.

But this law of life appeared to the soul of the Lord as the warning of life. The first fruits of the Gentiles pressed up to Him, the spirits of their aspiration began to call Him.[1] It was thus assured to Him that the field of Gentile life was white to the harvest, to conversion and redemption. But therewith also, before His spirit's glance, there stood the cross.

But how eminently characteristic is the utterance of Christ as the expression of His first greeting with the Hellenic Gentile spirit! The Hellenic spirit had until then, in its national development, sought for its satisfaction in the *beautiful appearance of actual life*, not in the actual life itself. It had represented the image of beautiful gods in ideal human forms; it had represented beautiful humanity in the appearance of divine glory. At the fair image of the incarnation of God it had stopped; its watchword had been that of Mignon, *Thus let me seem until I am!* Now it was to *become*, to be through Christ. Instead of the cold marble, it wished now to glorify the holy Son of man, it wished to adore the true divine humanity. But for that purpose it must now understand also the law of life, of the true manifestation of the divine-human life. Christ declared precisely what had been wanting to it—the truth that the truly glorified life proceeds out of death, out of the apparent negation of all the beauty of life—that in the kingdom of God there prevailed a watchword opposed to the Hellenic one. *Being* must precede *seeming:* they must know this of Christ, of whom the prophetic spirit had said there was no form nor beauty that we should desire Him; they must know it of the believers who cry to one another, Our life is hid with Christ in God, and it doth not yet *appear* what we shall be; they must know it, in fine, of the whole of Christian humanity, which was to attain its ideal glory of life, first of all from the resurrection from the dead,

[1] Acts xvi. 9.

which was to set forth a heaven of living images of God, having below it the dark world of death and fear that it has overcome, whilst the serene Olympus of the Greek world of gods was continually threatened by the overmastering kingdom of dark powers of death and destiny in the background; just as still every modern Olympus of the æsthetic world-view is always threatened by some such terrible background.

As this word of Jesus was altogether fitted to familiarize the Greeks with the first fundamental law of Christianity, in direct opposition to their earlier stand-point, the Lord had probably received the Greeks into His circle when He uttered it.[1] Christ immediately applies His leading address to His hearers. 'He that loveth his life,' says He further, 'shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.' The expression reminds us closely of similar ones in the Synoptists.[2] The claim upon a man to *hate* his life in this world,—that one should not seek to settle himself upon any special form of life and happiness in the sphere of the old worldly life, but should spiritually reach beyond the old forms in the yearning aspiration after eternal new forms, and should sacrifice before every duty to a loftier future,—this is made more strongly prominent here than elsewhere. He then more clearly urges His appeal to the disciples to hold themselves ready for suffering with Him: 'If any man serve Me, let him follow Me; and where I am, there shall also My servant be.' This is the claim, although He does not expect that the disciples should *now* go with Him to death. He desires of them, however, that they should by degrees acknowledge His Spirit's willingness to die,—should understand and enter with sympathy into it. As His servants, they shall one day, in the presentiment of His death, stand in the position in which He now stands. How easily a joyous excitement in the expressions of the two disciples might betray to Him, that they have not kept in their hearts His prediction of His death; and this perhaps is the reason why He so plainly urges upon them the last claim. The priestly spirit of a consecrated heart, conscious of the presentiment of great sorrows, is constantly grieved and wounded by every want of foreboding, by every

[1] See above, vol. iii. p. 74.

[2] On the question whether Jesus had admitted the Greeks to His presence, see Lücke.

impatience of sorrow in the joy of those who are intoxicated with hope around Him. Therefore, perhaps, Christ uttered the claim so definitely. He confirmed it, moreover, by a very significant promise: 'If any man *serve Me*, him will *My Father honour*.' Such an one as in humble service subordinates himself to the Son, the Father blesses and raises to His glory. For only in absolute dependence on the Son does man realize his true position towards God and towards the world; and thus he attains to the divine glory of life which is appointed for him in that position.

The Lord appears, first of all, to have wished to invite the sympathy of His disciples with the serious tone of mind which is now pressing upon Him more and more forcibly. 'Now is My soul troubled,' He continues; 'and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour:[1] but for this cause came I unto this hour.' The suffering of the hour is now the purpose of the hour; the corn of wheat must die, in order to bring forth much fruit. This state of mind is plainly akin to the soul-sorrow with which Jesus wrestled in Gethsemane. Its utterance recalls the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane. It has been shown before how profoundly consistent with experience is the representation that the sense of agony arising from the fear of death is not manifested in its greatest strength all at once, but, as it were, in a regular rhythm of recurring spiritual struggles.[2] And just as in Gethsemane, in His kingly power, He resists the enemies after He has prayerfully resigned His will to the will of His Father, so now, out of His anguish at the pains of death, He rises rejoicing at its glorious fruit, with the prayer, 'Father, glorify Thy name!'

When Jesus had spoken this word, there came the voice from heaven, 'I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.'

Jesus had been glorified by a voice from heaven for the first time at Jordan in the presence of John the Baptist, who by means of this testimony received the final great assurance concerning Him. For the second time the voice resounded over

[1] In accordance with the foregoing sentence, this appears certainly to require to stand in the form of a question. It then will still indicate a prayer, but a faint one. Compare what Lücke, 521, alleges for the contrary interpretation.

[2] See above, vol. i. 190.

Him on the Mount of Transfiguration, when it gave to the three confidential disciples a testimony of the glory of Christ. Now, for the third time, it sounded in the midst of the temple enclosure, at a moment when Christ was surrounded by His disciples, by the Jewish people, and also by the first fruits of the Gentile world.

The sound of the voice was a sound which all perceived, which startled them all.[1] But the various people perceived the spirit, and the meaning, and the effect of the voice in a very different manner. In this variation, the Evangelist makes peculiarly prominent three degrees. The multitude of the people heard only the terrible sound: they said it had thundered. Others had perceived with more spiritual attention the Spirit's voice in the sound; but they had not understood rightly the purpose of the voice, and its full meaning in the mind of the Speaker. They decided that an angel had spoken with Jesus. But the Evangelist and his brethren had doubtless acknowledged the voice as an immediate call of God from heaven. So also, above all, did the Lord.

We gather from the representation of the effect of that voice a fuller disclosure of its marvellous nature. That it made itself perceptible to all in a startling manner, is the expression of its objective side; it is a call of God, a wonderful sound. But this call has its subjective side, in the fact that its utterance and sound are creatively formed in the susceptibility of hearing and sound of the percipients. Hence the variety.[2]

[1] On the voices from heaven, see Lücke, 522. Compare Acts ix. 7, xxii. 7; Apoc. i. 10; Job iv. 12–16; 1 Sam. iii. 1–9.

[2] I must refer those who are still accustomed to the untenable distinction between *merely external* revelation and *merely internal* vision, to what has been already advanced on the voice which sounded at Jordan. They must first adjust this theory to the facts of Scripture, which combines manifestation and visions in living unity (yet so that sometimes the first, sometimes the second, impulse predominates). Especially also they must learn from the new physiology, that all colours, lights, tones, and tastes, and generally all phenomena which might affect the sense objectively, are contained in a subjective form latent in man, as in the microcosm. They could then also conceive how a creative divine voice may form to itself the measures of sound in men themselves, just as well and perhaps better than in the air, although an objective tone must perhaps be assumed in this great divine voice, just as well as the objective lightning. On the Bath-col of the Hebrews, compare Lücke, ii. 527.

When the crowd expressed themselves in such various manners upon the voice that they had perceived, and some gave utterance to the notion that an angel had had something mysterious to say to Jesus, He declared, by way of correcting them, 'This voice came not because of Me, but for your sakes.' Hereupon He explained to them the meaning of the heavenly utterance by the word: 'Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.'

This is the fundamental thought which animates Him, and fills Him with anguish and rapture. He knows that He is now advancing to death, to the death upon the cross, and through that to His glorification. To Him both these destinies are now thoroughly entwined into one; one prospect, one presentiment, one perspective; the lifting up on the cross, and the lifting up into heaven. But the two bright sides of this twofold lifting up are *these:* the prince of this world is now judged, is cast out. Therewith is the old world-fashion and the old world-variance between Jews and Greeks abolished. Here is the pharisaic spirit judged which stops His passage to the heathen with the curse of the cross; there is judged the Hellenic avoidance of the cross, which would be inclined to form a profanely efficient Apollo-form out of the fairest of the children of men. The judgment upon the ungodly spirit of the world must thus be now executed in His death, completed in His resurrection. But then a path is made for Him to all hearts, and then will He draw all men to Himself. All men, even the heathen, the Greeks. In this prospect of His redeeming Spirit, He reposes. That is the flower of His emotion. But as we have to consider His word as the explanation of the heavenly voice, its meaning is perhaps related to the two Testaments. The first glorification of the name of God occurred in the Old Testament theology for the people of Israel; the second, out of the foundation of the New Testament economy, should now go forth for all the world.[1] Thus the voice was proportioned to the greatness of the occasion and the significance of the place. In the enclosure of the temple itself, the voice of the Father solemnly declared before all the people that the first revelation is closed and completed, that

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 7.

now is beginning the second, and therefore higher one—the glorification of His name through Christ.[1]

The Evangelist observes that Jesus, in the word that He should be lifted up from the earth, refers to His death, and to the manner of it—the death on the cross. The people also understood this notification. But the people were now less than ever disposed to understand a declaration of this kind. Had not Christ made His entry into Jerusalem? Had He not to-day begun His theocratic rule in the temple? Must not glorious days begin henceforth for ever? They suggested this to Him with the remark, 'We have heard out of the law[2] that the Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest Thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man?' It appears to them confusing, that the conception of the Son of man, which is so strange to them, and of which such enigmatical things were spoken to them, should obscure to them the conception of the Messiah, with which they thought that they were familiar; therefore they desire further explanation upon that mysterious personality which Christ attributed to Himself, and upon its destiny. Thus, however, they were again on the way to lose sight of His closest relation to them—even in His presence, even in His glory upon Zion, to miss Him; yea, to dispute with the Messiah Himself on His festival day on Zion; to quarrel about the true character of the Messiah, in the interest of their orthodoxy and of their carnal expectation. Therefore Jesus warningly, and with the expression of gentle sadness, gave them the answer: 'Yet a little while is the light with you: walk while ye have the light.' Make no hindrance, He would perhaps say, no difficulty; walk, exert yourselves in the spirit; hasten still to attain the right object of knowledge, while the last gleam of daylight is above you,—'lest darkness come upon you,' adds the Lord.

'For he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.' This solemn record is perhaps spoken in deep and

1 Lücke refers the first word, ἐδόξασα, to the preceding life and works of Jesus; the second, δοξάσω, to His death. In opposition to this distinction, important as it is in itself, the explanation of Jesus Himself, above referred to, seems to testify, besides the consideration that the glorification of the name of God by Jesus forms a great unity, which is not completed till His resurrection.

2 Ps. cx. 4; Dan. vii. 14.

sorrowful foresight of the long and restless wandering which awaited the people of Israel after His death—that wandering in darkness, without repose and without object, even to the end of the world, even to the end of the age, which has been symbolically represented by the legend of the Wandering Jew.

Once more follows the admonition, 'While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.'

In this beautiful word, John perhaps comprehends everything which Jesus said on the following day ere He departed from the temple. He here closes his account of the last ministry of Jesus in the temple, with the statement that Jesus departed, and withdrew Himself from the people. This happened after the last words of parting which He spoke in the temple on the Tuesday.

The great day of honour which the Messiah spent in the recognition of His dignity in the temple was thus ended. It was only one day, but this one day was a presage of thousands of years, yea, of an eternity.

NOTES.

1. The expression, John xii. 31, *νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω*, evidently refers to Satan as the prince of this world. The death of Christ is the moment and the fact by which he is judged and cast out of the world. Therein, besides the general thought that the kingdom of Satan is broken by the death of Christ, is involved perhaps the special one—that it is broken, in that the evil principle of the avoidance of suffering—the Satan of the craving for appearances, for glory and for happiness—is overcome and judged by the holy cross of Christ. The worm of the old glory of the world is now expelled from the withered apple of the old world. At the same time, the mysterious expression appears to indicate a change in the relation of the satanic world to the world of humanity. With the victory of Christ in the history of the temptation, Satan was cast out of heaven; now through His death he is also cast out of the world. He rules now in the clouds, in the vagueness, in the undefined dispositions of the world. Later, he will be cast on the earth (Apoc. xii. 9). In the Apocalypse the earth perhaps indicates that which is established on earth in the world of humanity—hierarchic and social systems. Further on

Satan is threatened with being shut up in the abyss, and finally to be cast into the fiery hell (Apoc. xx.).

2. According to Von Baur, *On the Composition*, etc., 142, the Evangelist may have had 'even here, as usual, the synoptical Gospels before him, but have appropriated to himself their narratives of the glorification and of the soul-contest of Christ for his own ideal representation.' One need only appeal to ironical self-solutions of criticism of a similar kind.

SECTION VI.

THE END OF THE OLD TESTAMENT THEOCRACY. THE WITHERED FIG-TREE. THE INQUIRY ON THE PART OF THE SANHEDRIM FOR CHRIST'S AUTHORITY. THE SEPARATION BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE SANHEDRIM. THE PARABLE OF THE TWO SONS, OF THE MUTINOUS VINE-DRESSERS, AND OF THE WEDDING FEAST OF THE KING'S SON. THE IRONICAL TEMPTATIONS OF JESUS AS THE THEOCRATIC KING. THE COUNTER-QUESTION OF CHRIST. THE SOLEMN DENUNCIATION BY JESUS OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES. THE LAMENTATION OVER JERUSALEM, AND THE DEPARTURE FROM THE TEMPLE. THE LOOK OF APPROVAL ON THE WIDOW'S MITE.

(Matt. xxi. 10–xxiv. 2; Mark xi. 20–xiii. 2; Luke xix. 47–xxi. 6; John viii. 1-11.)

After the day of His kingly ministry in the temple, Jesus had again returned to Bethany, to pass the night in the dwelling of His friends. When on the following morning early He was returning to the city, and drew near to the fig-tree which, on the previous morning, He had cursed, Peter remembered the circumstance of yesterday, looked towards the tree, and observed with astonishment, that it was withered from the root to the top.[1] In an excited manner, he called the attention of the Lord to the wonderful phenomenon, and the disciples also were

[1] 'Dried up *from* the roots,' is the expression of Mark; and this is more significant than if it were—'*to* the roots.'

amazed that the fig-tree was so soon withered. But Jesus said to them, 'Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith.'

They were standing at this time opposite to the temple-mountain, perhaps even on its declivity. And this mountain, in its symbolic significance, as the representation of hierarchic Judaism, had now become a stumbling-block in His way. Thus He must now move this mountain out of the way by the word of His faith. The mountain must be cast into the sea; that is, the religious polity of Israel must be lost, by dispersion into the sea of Gentile life. And thus perhaps Jesus said the word not only by way of illustration, but as a symbolic expression of His work, of His endeavour, and of the expectation of His soul. The disciples, moreover, had to learn with Him, to struggle in faith against the hindrances of the kingdom of God. So He went on: 'Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.' But one condition He must most earnestly impose upon them: only in the spirit of reconciliation with all men could they thus pray in blessing; thus their prayer must never be against any man—never to the detriment of any soul, of any life. 'And when ye stand praying,' He says, 'forgive, if ye have ought against any; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.'[1]

And if this forgiveness be wanting, how could the heart unite with God, and work miracles by His power?

The phenomenon of the withered fig-tree may be considered, according to the relations in which this symbol stood to the Israelitish theocracy, as a mournful prognostic of what was to come to pass in Israel on that day. Hardly had the Lord, for instance, again entered the temple enclosure to teach the people, than there met Him a portion of the Sanhedrim, who may perhaps be considered as a representation of the entire Jewish

[1] There is nothing surprising about the repetition of such an expression as this.

authority, with a formal interrogatory, having for object to put an end to His ministry. He had not yet sat down, when this group of hierarchs, composed of chief priests, scribes, and elders, stood threateningly before Him. Their question was, 'By what authority doest Thou these things? and who gave Thee this authority? The question is entirely a theocratic law-question, and is measured in every particular. They do not define more closely what He does, because they do not wish to acknowledge that He teaches, and does miracles. But they have in view His whole ministry and appearance, and refer to that. In the first question, they sought to ascertain by what power and authority in the abstract He stood there; in the second, who had invested Him with this authority in the way of the lawful ordination of theocratic tradition. Thus also, the first question is an appeal to His *prophetic* authority—to His inspiration: it has in view His name of Messiah. The second, on the other hand, would fain know His *historic* authority—His legitimation—would have His introduction among the people explained by some acknowledged power. And yet these hypocrites knew well that John the Baptist had pointed the people to Him—had introduced Him among the people. They thus were aware who had introduced Him according to the theocratic regulation, and in what character he had pointed Him out. Therefore it was entirely in the spirit of their own notions of legitimacy, when Jesus replied, 'I will also ask of you one question, and answer Me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?

Thus they must first of all declare whether they acknowledge the prophetic authority of John; whether they accepted him, with his baptism, as being the herald sent from God of the kingdom of heaven, and of the Messiah. His declaration depended on that. If, for instance, they acknowledged John, then they had still a legitimate theocratic jurisdiction, to which he was bound and willing to render an account in matters of the kingdom of God. But if they rejected the authority of John, He would, indeed, still acknowledge them as being the hierarchical authorities in the land; but as the authorized administrators of the Old Testament economy he could no longer

acknowledge them, and therefore needed no longer to give account to them in a question of the kingdom.

At the counter-question of Jesus, the deputation fell into the extremest perplexity. They saw, indeed, that they could not answer it without considerable risk. If, for instance, they acknowledged the authority of John, Jesus might reproach them with having been disobedient to God's message in him, which had directed them to Himself. But if they characterized the baptism of John as being from men; in other words, if they were to reject it as fanaticism, they must be careful of falling out with the whole people, yea, lest the people might stone them for such an act of unbelief, because all men honoured John as a prophet.

They resolved upon a desperate step, and declared, 'We know not.' This circumstance alone would have been sufficient to make these proud hierarchs deadly enemies of Jesus, even if they had not been so before—that He had extorted from them such a confession of ignorance, and, above all, of *feigned* ignorance, in the court of the temple, in the hearing of all the people. With this declaration, which they would make with the greatest windings of embarrassment, with mysterious phrases about the difficulty of the point, they were no longer looked upon by Jesus as a legitimate Sanhedrim; and He very decidedly declares, 'Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.'

Thus the Lord, in His supremacy, had constrained the high college to exhibit themselves in the sheerest ignorance in the midst of the crowd of people. But He went still further, and compelled the hierarchs likewise to bear testimony themselves of their crime; while He proposed to them parables which had reference to them, and which He allowed themselves to complete in their judicial conclusion.

First of all, He passed before them the parable of the two doubly unlike sons of one father, whom he would send to work in his vineyard. Jesus describes to them the two sons: the first as saying No, to the command of the father, but nevertheless afterwards repenting and going; the other as saying hypocritically *Yes*, and nevertheless not going; and requires from them the decision which of the two did the will of the father. They could not help answering according to the prophetic and

ethic judgment,[1] the first. And He then plainly states to them, that, under the form of the first son, He had referred to the publicans and harlots; and under that of the second—themselves. John, says He, came to them in the way of righteousness: that is, not as a fanatic, but thoroughly authenticated according to the Old Testament law, and by his own righteous life. But in refusing their belief to him, they had been guilty of a threefold crime. They ought, first of all, to have set the example of faith on him to the people, and they did not. They ought, in this particular at least, to have kept on the level of the publicans and harlots, and they did not. Finally, they ought at least to have allowed themselves to be shamed by the faith which was manifested by these despised masses; but it was in vain.

Then, in the second parable, Jesus describes the rebellious vine-dressers, who will not supply the lord of the vineyard with any fruit; who ill-treat the servants whom he despatches to them; nay, who even put to death his son and only heir, that they may seize upon the vineyard for themselves. Once more, He allows themselves to declare the sentence, when He asks them what the Lord of the vineyard would do to those servants; and they answered Him, that he would miserably destroy those wicked men, and would let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, who should render him the fruits in their seasons. Therein, once more, they were uttering their own condemnation. According to the Evangelists, it cannot be supposed that they did this without perceiving the meaning of the parable, especially after Christ had explained to them the first parable. Rather they sought to play the dispassionate hearers; and with a severe effort of the hypocritical spirit, they succeeded in throwing down the decision as though they did not observe anything (Matt. xxi. 45).

Jesus quite understood that, with their hypocritical impartiality, they wished to display an affected contempt for Him; therefore He pressed more severely upon them, reminding them of a passage of the Psalms, wherein the prophetic spirit had even sketched the fact that they would treat Him with contempt. 'Have ye then never read the passage,' asked He, reprovingly: 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and

[1] Ezek. xviii. 20; comp. xxxiii. 12.

it is marvellous in our eyes?' (Ps. cxviii. 22, 23). They could not deny that this place refers to the Messiah, and that the Messiah is here designated as a stone which the builders on Zion would reject, as wholly unfit for the building of the temple, but which the Lord would make the corner-stone, in spite of their terrible unfaithfulness, and ignorance, and resistance. Such a text, He then remarks, fully entitled Him to apply the previously related parable to them, and to say to them, 'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' Here He had in view the New Testament congregation, as the real new people of God, contrasted with the old typical people. He then returns to the despised stone, portraying to them its reaction against its despisers, referring to other places, namely, to Isa. viii. 14, 15, and Dan. ii. 45: 'And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.'

In the first place, they shall themselves judge themselves, and perish by the fact that they sit in judgment upon the Son of God, and then their ruin will accomplish itself in the fact that the Son of God sits in judgment upon them. Or if we consider His reaction against His despisers by His sufferings inflicted by the world, He will first of all judge the world according to the representation of the marvellous stone in Isaiah; and then His glory over the world will come to the last judgment of the world, according to Daniel's picture of the stone.

The Evangelists observe in this place, that the chief priests and Pharisees had perceived the meaning of these parables, and in their exasperation would have liked to lay hold on Jesus; but they were restrained from so doing by their fear of the people, who honoured Jesus as a prophet.

In this state of mind, they must receive one more parable from the mouth of Jesus, in which, assuredly, all the fulness of His compassion for them was once more clearly expressed. It was the parable of the marriage of the king's son, and of the invited guests, who, notwithstanding their acceptance of the invitation, declined the feast, to their ruin.

When in this parable, moreover, He depicted to them the judgment upon the man who had come to the feast without

having on a wedding garment, He gave them to understand thereby, that the kingdom of righteousness, on which they professed to set so much value, would only continue to exist by means of the kingdom of His grace.

With the conflict between Jesus and the hierarchical power, on the subject of John's authority, his separation from them, and at the same time from the temple, was already decided. But when, in addition, He had humiliated them in the very midst of the temple court, nay, had made their official dignity of no account, it seemed to them as if He would pursue his successful work in this place in spite of them. Although they did not venture forcibly to lay hands on Him here, yet they believed that they might craftily eject Him from His commanding position; and thus they ironically agreed to the assumption of the popular party actually predominant, that He was the theocratic Lord and Judge in the land, and sought, by mock demonstrations of respect, to ensnare Him in some wile.

Under this point of view, we have perhaps to conceive of the temptations with which they now assailed Him; among which, as was above intimated, we regard the bringing before Him of the woman taken in adultery.[1]

The first temptation proceeded from an association of the party of the Pharisees with the party of the Herodians. In political matters these parties could combine in their common aversion to the Roman supremacy in the country; thus making a theocratic patriotic interest, although in their more precise purpose they might be disagreed among themselves. Upon this theocratic patriotic interest they based their plan. They wished to compel the Lord to express Himself upon the sovereign rights of the Romans over Judæa. If He declared Himself absolutely in their favour, there was an end of His popularity among the people. But they rather hoped that He would declare Himself against them; for it surpassed all their conceptions, that one should claim to be the Messiah and yet acknowledge the supremacy of the Romans in the land, all the more that they themselves were conscious of another disposition towards the Romans. They thought also to beguile Him, in His presumed fanatical enthusiasm, to speak against the Romans, and they would then have delivered Him to the Roman governor as a seditious person (Luke xx. 20).

[1] John viii. 2–11.

The question which they had chosen for that purpose seemed to be a certain snare; and the men who were to propose the inquiry were well selected, expert, plausible persons, who knew how to give to themselves the air of being careful for the theocratic privilege, and of coming to Jesus with a difficult scruple of conscience, with masterly hypocrisy (Luke xx. 20). Thus they came before Him. First of all they seek Him, with a flatteringly designed acknowledgment of His high candour and independence, to ask, 'Master, we know that Thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth; neither carest Thou for any man, for Thou regardest not the person of men.' How appropriately they thus in these words describe Him as one who is always *true* because He is *free*, and is always free because He is *righteous!* It is the deepest mystery of wickedness, that it can so imagine and feign to itself the acknowledgment of what is holy, without acknowledging it at all in truth; and that it can employ the highest appearance of truth in the deepest interests of falsehood. After such an introduction, which has already intimated that they wish to encourage Him in fanatical excitement to speak a noble, brave, but hazardous and ruinous word, they speak out their question: 'Tell us therefore, What thinkest Thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or no?'

Jesus, however, penetrated them.[1] 'Why tempt ye Me, ye hypocrites?' said He to them; and then said, as if determined on His reply, 'Show Me the tribute-money.' They brought Him a denarius. 'Whose is this image,' He asked them, 'and superscription?' They answered, 'Cæsar's.' Thereon followed the decision: 'Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's.' They were dumb and amazed at the convincing answer, and slunk away; their purpose of entrapping Him before the people in His answer had miscarried.

This word of the Lord is one of the most wonderful flashes of great and instantaneous presence of mind which occur in His whole life. It comprehends in its brevity and simplicity an entire theory of political law, and of its relation to the rights of the theocracy.

[1] Matthew says He knew their wickedness, Mark that He perceived their hypocrisy, and Luke that He perceived their craftiness. Each in his individual and characteristic view.

The first fundamental thought is perhaps this: Money represents the carnal, earthly side of the political life; the stamp on the coin indicates the sovereign lord over this temporality of the State; the acknowledgment of the appointed coin of the realm with the stamp, indicates the actual acknowledgment of the supremacy which the stamp represents.

Those who have acknowledged the coin of a sovereign in their land as the coin of the realm, have done allegiance to him thereby.[1] They in manifold ways receive the coin from the hand of the prince, in profit, in pay, in gifts. They enjoy all sovereign protection and blessing which is connected with life in this appointed political union. Therefore, if they were to reject his actual supremacy, they would be in an outrageous manner depriving him of what is his due, what God had given him, what they had acknowledged his, and wherewith he had in many ways united them, and engaged them to his service.

The second leading thought is this: The entire life of man does not belong to Cæsar, nor is it subject to worldly supremacy. Contrasted with the kingdom of Cæsar stands the kingdom of God, as the kingdom of the inner life. What is God's, man must give to God. But the image of God is originally impressed upon the inner nature of man, therefore man is bound to surrender his inner life to God. God only must be Lord in this sphere of the inner life—of the conscience.[2]

Thence follows the third principal thought, that man should continually be regarded as rightly divided between these two regions. In the first place, man is not to conceive that the two must of necessity coincide, or be confounded together. In the second place, it is not to be imagined that the one kingdom may be taken as a pretext for sinning against the regulations of the other: for thus it might be possible to appeal to the supreme claims of God, for the withdrawal from Cæsar of the secular obedience due to him; or to the supremacy of Cæsar as a justi-

[1] The Rabbis taught that if the inhabitants of a country had acknowledged the coin of a prince as the coin of their land, they had thereby acknowledged the prince himself. Comp. Sepp, iii. 257. [The words of Maimonides are, 'Ubicunque numisma regis alicujus obtinet, illic incolæ regem istum pro domino agnoscunt.'—Ed.]

[2] [Ellicott (p. 305, note), after Meyer (*in loc.*), objects to this interpretation as too narrow and partial, and as restricting what was intended to be inclusive of all, whether material or spiritual, that is due to God.—Ed.]

fication of sin against the rights of God. Thirdly, it should be known that both these kingdoms may subsist in regular interworking and union, and that this interworking is perfected in the measure in which their distinction is clearly made, and thence their union thoroughly completed. If the kingdom of Cæsar be pure from all encroachments on the kingdom of God, it will become a perfectly blessed government, even a representation of the kingdom of God in the visible world. And if the kingdom of God attains its full power over the spirits, it becomes the highest authority in all a country's concerns.

The answer of Jesus was purposely framed to release the Jews from their fundamental errors. They were accustomed to those views of the theocracy which represented the kingdom of God and the power of the princes in an undistinguishable unity. This state of things they fancied must always continue. Thus they made no distinction between the two spheres of life, although they had actually acknowledged the power of Cæsar as the political rule. Sometimes they alleged their duty towards Jehovah their highest King for the purpose of an insurrection, sometimes they alleged the claims of Cæsar for the purpose of carrying out some hierarchical design. Jesus showed them that it was full time to effect the distinction between the State and the kingdom of God — or even the community of God's Church—in their conscious claims, since such a distinction had long existed by the disposition of God and according to their own acknowledgment. They had become bound in allegiance to Cæsar, therefore they ought to discharge their duty to Cæsar. But they must not conceive that thereby their duty towards God was relaxed.

In effect, this was what they did appear to conceive, when they tempted the anointed of God. They did not give to God what was God's, any the more that they hypocritically pretended, that for His sake they were anxious to refuse to Cæsar his claims. Nay, a short time subsequently, they went so far as to urge the representative of Cæsar, by the appeal to Cæsar, to crucify their Messiah. The most glorious thing that was God's, which God had entrusted to them, that they might restore to Him, they withdrew from Him, and cast it in the most importunate manner to Cæsar.

Give to God what is God's! Jesus would say this to them

in a tone fraught with warning, and with the most painful feeling, that they were actually purposing to cast away to Cæsar their marvellous endowment, stamped with the radiant image of God; while they were pretending to make grave scruples whether they should pay to Cæsar the poor tributary penny stamped with Cæsar's image.

The reason has been already suggested above,[1] for supposing that even the bringing of the adulteress to Jesus,—the narrative of which occurs in the beginning of the 8th chapter of John's Gospel,—happened in connection with the rest of the temptations of this day. This proceeding has precisely the same ironical character as the others; but is distinguished from the previous one, that it appears as a temptation on the part of the Pharisees and scribes. The Pharisees had discovered that they were likely to accomplish nothing in union with the Herodians, in the field of theocratic-political questions. They seemed, therefore, now to wish to try their fortune in association with the scribes on the field of theocratic-matrimonial law; for which purpose an entirely recent case might furnish the occasion. This circumstance seemed to come to the relief of their discomfiture. Jesus had plainly distinguished between the obligation to the Roman claims and the obligation to the theocratic claims, and had assumed that the one could be obeyed consistently with the other. But now they believed that they had discovered a case of collision, with which they could certainly embarrass or entrap Him. By their subordination under the Roman supremacy, for instance, they were precluded from putting any man to death; and yet it was commanded them, in the law of Moses, to slay the adulteress who had thus been taken in the very act.[2] This collision, which they had indeed successfully set aside in other cases previously by passive obedience to the constituted authority, or even by voluntary forgiveness of the adulteress, they fancied that they should be able to turn into a stumblingblock in the way of the Lord; if perhaps He should venture to declare Himself otherwise than according to the effectual execution of the Mosaic law. It is thus evident how extremely appropriate is the history to this place. It was to prove that it was not altogether so easy a

[1] Book II. v. 17.

[2] Lev. xx. 10. Comp. Hitzig, *Ueber. Joh. Markus*, 209.

matter to distinguish between what was Cæsar's and what was God's!

The narrative, moreover, with its introductory words, transports us at once to the actual time: Jesus has arrived early at the city from the Mount of Olives, to whose declivity on the further side Bethany belonged; and is seated teaching in the temple, surrounded by the people. The scribes, in conjunction with the Pharisees, bring before Him there a guilty woman,—a woman who has been taken in the act of adultery. They tell Him the circumstance, then remind Him of the Mosaic law, according to which such a convicted adulteress was to be stoned;[1] and call upon Him accordingly to declare his decision thereupon.

But Jesus stooped down, and wrote with His finger upon the earth. This is the only time that it is recorded of Him in the Evangelic history that He had written anything; and this one time He writes with His finger in the dust.

It is not known what He then wrote, and the most various conjectures have been hazarded thereupon.

They made Him a judge in an action wherein they stood before Him themselves as deeply deserving condemnation. If He had actually acquiesced in their expectations, and become a judge in Zion, He must have blasted them themselves with His word; but His whole nature was adverse to their expectations: therefore, ashamed for them, yes, embarrassed by their forward perversity, He shrank within Himself; and probably this it was first of all which His writing expressed.[2]

They wished for a theocratic legal sentence from Him how the woman should be punished. This sentence (not the judgment on her inward guilt, but that upon her theocratic criminal culpability) He wrote in the dust.[3]

[1] Lev. xx. 20. On the kind of punishment, compare Hitzig, as above, 209. [Meyer quotes from the Talmud, 'Filia Israelitæ, si adultera, cum nupta, strangulanda, cum desponsata, lapidanda.'—Ed.]

[2] [On this writing, Euthymius says: ὅπερ εἰώθασι πολλάκις ποιεῖν οἱ μὴ θέλοντες ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτῶντας ἄκαιρα καὶ ἀνάξια; that is, it was an action customarily resorted to by those who were unwilling to answer unseasonable and unseemly questions. The remarks of Tholuck on the passage are to the same effect. And for the strange opinions of those who have conjectured what was written, see Lampe, ii. 374.—Ed.]

[3] Jer. xvii. 13. Hitzig, 215.

Whether He wrote words in the dust, we know not. If He wrote words, they were probably those which He immediately afterwards uttered, when He observed that they continued insolently standing, and consequently actually persevered in their question; whilst He, surprised, looked upon them again—the answer, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.'

This answer has been thought to confuse the religious point of view with the juridical; but it exactly shows that Jesus desires to rebuke such a confusion in the adversaries. The theocratic punishment of the adulteress could only be significant, so long as the religion and the criminal justice were entwined into one (what is God's and what is Cæsar's). So long as this condition subsisted, there were always found spirits which, in prophetic or zealous enthusiasm, could juridically perform the religious decrees of God; but this time was now gone by. The religious judgment on the crime of adultery was now actually separated from the juridical, not only in the consciousness of the time, but by the civic order. According to the existing Roman laws, the adulteress could not be punished with death.[1] The enemies of Jesus, however, pretended in this case to appeal to the ancient unity of the two orders of things; but He assented to this assumption in order to abolish it; while He required of them that he who would begin the stoning must feel himself free from sin. Therein He in no wise annulled the civic criminal prosecution against the adulteress; but only the confusion of the religious and the juridicial point of view, which the opponents wished in a hypocritical manner again to bring into play. Herein it is certainly not to be overlooked, that, according to the form of His sentence, He altogether assents to the assumption that the woman ought to be stoned. The infinite boldness of His word, in this respect, has perhaps not been sufficiently considered: 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.' How, if one of these self-righteous people had believed that he was conscious of no sin? The woman must, in any case, according to her darkened mind, have shrunk at the word of Jesus, and for a moment have expected the stoning: she must thus have experienced the doom of death in spirit—and Jesus appeared for a moment to take on Himself a great

[1] Hitzig, 211.

risk, by the decided form of His word, as opposed to the Roman law, which did not permit such an execution; but He well knew that the opponents *could not fail* to understand Him. They must have been conscious of their guilt at His word, and therefore their proceeding was exhausted.

After the expressed declaration, Jesus went on again writing on the ground. But the word of the Judge who would not condemn, began to have effect. The accusers of the adulteress began to go out, convicted by their consciences. So reprovingly worked the Spirit, the word, and the silence of Christ, that by degrees the consciousness of guilt—perhaps even in respect of the law of marriage—drove them all out from His presence. And according to the order in which this consciousness of guilt was realized, they slunk out one by one. The departure began first in the ranks of the eldest, and continued till the whole company of accusers had dissolved itself. They had assumed to themselves the air of a holy company, as they stood there in theocratic jealousy; a company which was entitled to remove the sin of adultery in the old manner out of Israel, by the doom of jealousy. But how soon had Jesus brought them to the actual acknowledgment that it was otherwise now with them—otherwise with the people; and that therefore it must also be otherwise with the legal ordinances in the land!

At length the woman stood there still alone. It is a marvellous operation of His Spirit not to be overlooked, that the woman still continues standing there, and remains standing, as if chained, after all the accusers are gone. She appears actually to perceive the majesty of the Judge in Him; therefore she neither can nor will escape. Jesus at length looks up, and sees her standing there alone, placed opposite to Him. 'Woman, where are those thine accusers?' He asked her. Probably no answer followed—a good sign that she was *not* ready to triumph over her accusers. Then He continues, 'Hath no man condemned thee?' She answered, 'No man, Lord.' Hereupon He dismisses her with the word, 'Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more.'

The civil process which her husband might undertake against her was, of course, not set aside thereby. And whether, by the judgment of Christ's Spirit, she was willing to lay hold of the forgiving grace of God in her heart, was to be manifested in her

future conduct. But in respect of the Old Testament theocratic doom of capital punishment, she was released therefrom in Sion, by the decision of Christ, because no person free from sin had been found among her accusers, who with assurance *could* execute *this* capital punishment, and because Christ, who was really free from sin, *would* not execute the capital punishment at all. Moreover, He would not do so, *firstly*, because He had already executed this punishment on the woman spiritually, in His sentence; then because in the process there was a nullity, viz., the false purpose of the accusers; and finally, in the third place, because He had postponed His theocratic judicial ministry to the end of the world.

After this failure, the party of the Sadducees would attempt to overcome Him from their point of view. It corresponds entirely with the importance of this day, that all the spiritual powers of the time, as they are tending to darkness, make assault upon the Lord, who now allows the full glory of His light to break forth upon Zion. Already is observed the approach of the great hour of darkness, in the fact, that all parties which usually are struggling with one another to the death, now come into a demoniacal agreement, neglecting everything else but their fierce enmity against Christ.

The Sadducees arrange their question according to their standing-point. They proceed on the supposition, that there is nothing in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. Nay, they think that they may be able to make out from the law of Moses, that that doctrine is in contradiction to that law. This contradiction they wish to bring before the Lord in an instance, and desire to compel Him, in His decision, either to approve of their denial of the resurrection, or to contradict the law of Moses, or, finally, helplessly to admit that He could not solve the problem. Thus, in any case, they thought to have discredited Him in the sight of the people.

They proceed upon a legal position of Moses, because it is their intention to force out a contradiction between the law of Moses, according to their apprehension, and the doctrine of resurrection. This is the prescription on the subject of the Levirate marriage (Deut. xxv. 5). If a husband die without children, the brother was to marry the widow, and the first son that is born of this union was to be considered the son of the

deceased, and was to continue the name. They proceed to show, by a grotesque and coarsely contrived illustration, to what this law might lead. Seven brothers have married the same widow, one after the other, because none of those that died bequeathed children. They think that the fulfilment of the law *must* be carried on, even to this result. But upon this result they think that the doctrine of the resurrection must be quite wrecked. But in order to make this out, they must construct just as rude a caricature out of the doctrine of the resurrection, in proportion as they have treated that law of Moses with rude casuistry, and made of it a scarecrow.

Thus they assume, that it is part of the doctrine of the resurrection to conceive of the future life as a familiar continuation of the present; so that not only conjugal unions should be repeated in the future, but even that conjugal rights and duties should pass over from the present life with the deceased into the future life. According to this gross and stupid supposition, which they, in the true modern pettifogging spirit, could force upon the doctrine of the resurrection, they now propose the question, 'When, therefore, these seven brethren meet with the woman in the resurrection-world, which of them ought then to have her to wife again?'

The answer of the Lord was entirely fitted for such a question: 'Ye err; ye are trifling with a false notion,' said He; 'and for this simple reason, because ye know neither the Scriptures, nor the power of God.'

They would fain be the men of knowledge, the enlightened ones in Israel. But their knowledge was delusion; and, indeed, a delusion which depended upon a twofold ignorance.

They made their boast of rightly understanding the holy Scriptures—in choosing to consider them, more especially the Mosaic Scriptures, only in their literal legalism, as the rule of doctrine—and in asserting that in them the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is not contained. But Jesus at once informs them, 'that they know not the Scriptures.' Moreover, they also thought, perhaps, that they had been entrusted with the true and lively conception of the world—that they understood the living divine government, as contrasted with the dead representations of the kingdom of God in this world and the next, which they thought were found among the orthodox Jews.

This imagination likewise Jesus cast down. They know not the power of God. They know not the living God, who has power over themselves, over the world, over the dust of death: they manifested this by their denial of the resurrection of the dead. The one ignorance, moreover, was both the cause and effect of the other. Because they had no profound understanding of the Scriptures, they had only a feeble and diluted impression of the divine nature: to them it was, according to the delusion of the heathen, a *feeble impersonal* nature: and because they had had no experience of the power of God in His awakening Spirit, the Scriptures were closed to them; and they gathered from them only contradictions and offences, instead of faith.

Hereupon Jesus at once proceeds to the proof of His charge. The Sadducees like best to argue from mere assertion, not from the Scriptures. Thus they assert here, for example, that if the doctrine of the resurrection must have a meaning, it must needs be this, that the dead carry with them over into the other world the legal circumstances of this world. To this impudent and false assertion the Lord opposes a holy and true one—such an one as may be considered as the true explanation of the doctrine of the resurrection.

'They,' says He, 'which shall be accounted worthy to attain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. For they cannot die any more, because they are equal to the angels in heaven, and are sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection.'

According to Luke, the Lord speaks plainly of an attaining to the resurrection, as proceeding from the pressing through to the kingdom of God, and as what may appear as the reward and as the confirmation of faithfulness. The future world of the unfaithful and the lost, as opposed to this new world of those who are approved, does not come here into consideration, for it is a world of sin and death. But those who are approved have now become children of the resurrection, in that they have pressed through to the resurrection. Moreover, they are thereby approved as God's children; and they are lifted up into the sphere of the everlasting angels. They have not become angels, but angel-like natures; that is to say, they are transplanted into the region of an imperishable being, raised above mortality and death. They cannot die any more; but for that reason also the

conjugal unions are discontinued, those which form the counterpoise of death in the earthly world. It is plain that the Lord here derives all special decisions as to the position of the blessed in the future life, from the fact that they are passed through death into life in the way of the Spirit.

Incidentally He shows to the Sadducees, who also impugned the doctrine of the angels,[1] how little He feared and regarded their denials, in thus designedly citing the angels in heaven as personalities, whose existence must be presupposed with certainty.

But that those who are mortal can press through to immortality—this He attributes to the power of God. He proves to them that God has the power to call back the dead to life, and that by this power He actually does arouse the dead to life. And this He proves to them from the second book of Moses—precisely from those words of Scripture which introduce the giving of the law, which must thus have in their eyes, and from their point of view, the highest authority: 'And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read,' He asks, 'in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, and said, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' And he adds, 'But God is not the God of the dead, but of the living!'

There are some who fancy that the holy Teacher in scriptural interpretation has argued here after the manner of the Jewish Rabbis, and that His proof is rather an artifice of rabbinical casuistry, than a proof of the doctrine of the resurrection drawn generally from the substance of relevant passages, and from the spirit and life of the Old Testament. But such a notion incurs in an aggravated measure the reproach that Christ urged against the Sadducees, and which at the end of His discourse He once again repeats.[2] That the doctrine of the resurrection cannot, indeed, be a dogma developed in the Old Testament, is evident from the nature of the case. We may not seek there, in general, for any doctrine unfolded in the Christian ecclesiastical form, and still less in the abstract form in which the rationalistic theology lays down its doctrines. But in the manner of a living germ, all Christian ecclesiastical doctrines are really contained

1 Acts xxiii. 8.

2 Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 647; compare, on the other hand, Ebrard, 383.

in the Old Testament. They must needs be found in this form there, as certainly as the New Testament is the organic realization of the Old Testament. The Lord assumes this canon; and in pursuance of it He finds, with the perfect glance of a master, the living germ of the doctrine of the resurrection absolutely there, where usually an enlightened theologian, to say nothing of one of the modern pantheistic critics, would not have readily sought for it.

If we desire to have a proof of the resurrection of the dead, the very point on which it depends is this—that God makes Himself known as the personal God, who draws up His elect as personal natures to Himself, in that He makes with them an everlasting covenant—in that He is their God. Therein appears the power of God. He has power over His own nature in everlastingly perfected self-consciousness. He is thus a personal being. Therefore He has also the power to call personal beings into life, and to make with them an everlasting covenant, in whose power they are raised up above death. In this power He reveals Himself as the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. The fact that in His revelation He thus calls Himself, involves the proof to the intelligent mind of the resurrection of the dead. For how could the eternally living One name Himself after those that are dead, and unknown in the flood of universal existence? As God, He lives for them who live. He thus continues to live for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and these continue to live for Him. Because He is *their* God, they also have in Him everlasting life, and in their individuality they are eternally one with Him. Yea, to Him live all the dead.

This argument produced so striking an effect on all the bystanders, that again a great astonishment stirred the masses of the people. Nay, the argument of Jesus produced so powerful an impression even on the scribes, who even to this day had for the most part a common interest with the Sadducees, that some were induced to cry to the Lord, 'Master, Thou hast well said!' After this answer, none of the Sadducees ventured to ask Him any further questions.

Even the Pharisees could not resist a glad excitement when they heard how He had checked the loquacity of the Sadducees.

This intelligence was an occasion for them to collect together

with the impulse of the corporate spirit. Although they were sworn enemies of Jesus, and laboured for His downfall, yet there was one point in which they were in accord with Him against the Sadducees,—namely, their estimate of the system of faith developed in the Old Testament. But from this standing Christ had now beaten the Sadducees. Therefore they acquiesced in this victory with gladness, as a pretended victory of their system. And the mischievous pleasure at the humiliation of their rivals enhanced their glad tumult. This pleasure, indeed, could not reconcile them to Jesus. Rather they determined now once more to put Him to the proof. In the department of Scripture learning He had overcome the Sadducees; therefore they laid the plan of providing a defeat for Him in this department, in order thereby to win a double triumph, as well over Him as over the hateful alliance which He had defeated. They appear to have determined on this plan in consequence of their conjecture that Jesus had only to thank a lucky chance for His victory in scriptural interpretation. But if a question were proposed to Him which pertained to learned exposition, it would be easy to manifest His entire ignorance.

Upon this trial the evangelical narratives are quite distinct from that occurrence when Jesus discoursed with a scribe in Galilee, upon the question which was the weightiest commandment in the law.[1] In that place the scribe recites the first and great commandment; here it is Jesus. In that place the declaration is drawn forth in connection with the question, What must I do, that I may inherit eternal life? here in connection with the question, Which is the principal of all the commandments? the chief command which embraces all the others? But even this occurrence itself is not related in an exactly similar manner by the Evangelists Matthew and Mark. According to Matthew, the man learned in the law, who represents the question of the Pharisees to the Lord, adduces the question to tempt Him; but, according to Mark, he asks Him, prompted

[1] On this distinction, see Strauss, i. 650. When the author afterwards seeks to obliterate this distinction, in order to reduce that account of Luke, with the narratives of the two first Evangelists, of the present temptation of Jesus, to a free play of early Christian tradition, such an operation lies at the root of the often-noticed deficiency in perception of the various spiritual phenomena of various situations.

by the gratification that he had received from the excellent answer given by the Lord to the Sadducees, and, in the main, he occupies a friendly attitude towards Him. Now there is really no opposition here, but a diversity of apprehension, which is intended to render the circumstance clear to us. The Pharisees select from their midst, one learned in the law, whom they had sent for especially to oppose to the Lord in Scripture learning; and they give him the charge to propose a question to Him. It is this which Matthew has in view, and under this aspect he relates the whole fact; he sees in it, according to his systematic mode of regarding, a new and probably the last onslaught of the Pharisees for the purpose of entrapping Jesus. Mark, on the other hand, has in view the individual. He, for instance, certainly belonged to the better disposed of his position; that is evidenced by the whole way in which he discharged himself of his commission. Probably he placed the difficulty of his question specially in its form, whilst he either asked with mysterious expression after the great commandment in the law, or playfully asked after the first of the commandments; but in each case he *meant* the command that comprehends all commands. But the question was exceedingly opportune for the Lord, as He extricated its meaning forthwith out of the scholastically difficult form, and as there might perhaps have arisen even then a conventional opinion in the rabbinical theology on the great fundamental law; such as at least may be inferred from the agreement of this place with the earlier interview of Jesus upon the weightiest matter in the law with the scribe.[1] Nay, Jesus only needed in this case to repeat that answer which he formerly had received from the scribe. The Evangelist Mark communicates to us His answer in the completest manner: Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord. So runs the commencement,—the true covenant. God must not only be *the only God for the hearts*, but also the *only ruler in the hearts* of His people. Thence follows that fundamentally there is only one commandment, and that the first in the developed definition. Thou must love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. Thus proceeds the love of God from the very centre of our being: energizing from within outwards, it penetrates every re-

[1] Luke x. 25; compare above, II. v. 32.

gion of our life, until it has pervaded all our powers, and drawn them into its service. First of all, the man who has God's law written by love in his heart, loves God with his whole heart, in the germ of his nature, however the dispositions of his soul may still be darkened. But then the moods of his soul are elevated into this love, as well the dull tones of his sorrow as the bright vibrations of his joy. Hereupon he begins likewise to love God with his whole mind; in the earnest faith of his soul he seeks God with all his individual thoughts and self-determination; in his intercourse with the outer world he seeks and finds Him in all the experiences of his life, in all the forms of divine providence. And thus at length all his powers are drawn up into the great attraction of his soul; all are governed by love to God, and are glorified in this love. When the Lord had indicated to the scribe this commandment as the first and highest, He found it necessary to add to it, moreover: The other is of like importance with this. Thou must love thy neighbour as thyself. There is no commandment greater than these two. Thus Christ links together indissolubly into one, the true love of God, the true love of one's neighbour, and the true love of oneself. The true love of oneself, or the nobility in which man observes the divine in his life, must always verify itself in the true love of one's neighbour, which seeks and acknowledges the divine in one's neighbour; the latter must always be maintained by the former. But both must proceed in their unity, as the true divine love of man, from the true love of God: with this they must be animated, and represent it in the life. This answer of Jesus appears not only to surprise the scribe by its justice, but also to affect him strongly by the spirit in which He spoke; his reply appears to indicate this: 'Well, Master, Thou hast said the truth, that there is one God, and there is none other but He. And to love Him with the whole heart,' adds the scribe, in his own free judgment, 'and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.' From the last observation the inference may be drawn, that many of the Pharisees might be awaiting an answer which should exalt sacrifice higher than the duty of love, or should elevate the ceremonial law over the fundamental law of the ten commandments. But the scribe was not in the least disposed to acquiesce

in such presumption; rather, in his inclination to Jesus, the spirit of contradiction appeared to bestir itself against the spirit of the corporation which had given him so equivocal a commission. Jesus, however, rejoiced at his answer, since it testified of lively consideration, and said to him, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' Not far! This expression was so significant, that it might become in the soul of such a scribe perchance an incentive to seek with full purpose of heart for an *entrance* into the kingdom of God.

After this victory of Jesus over the Pharisees, in which He not only had subdued the questioner, but had almost drawn him to His side, no one ventured any more to come to Him with such a trial-question. But now He reversed the order, and for once proposed a question to His adversaries, as they were collected in a group around Him.

He asks them whose son Christ is; and they answer Him, The Son of David. Hereupon He puts before them the problem which they are to solve for Him. 'David,' says He, 'in the book of Psalms (Ps. cx.[1]), says of the Messiah, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool. David therefore calleth Him Lord: how is He then his son?'

The question of Jesus attains its whole importance, if we reflect that He was now ruling in the temple as Messiah, not only according to His own consciousness, but by the acknowledgment also of the people; nay, that His adversaries themselves had apparently acquiesced in the recognition of Him as Messiah. They were all of one mind with Him in the assurance, that in the psalm to which he had referred it was the Messiah that was spoken of. But how marvellous appears to us the tranquillity of mind of Jesus, if we reflect on His being able thus to discuss with them the dignity of the Messiah! And those words which He,

[1] Upon the Messianic character of the Psalms, compare Ebrard, 384. The Psalms are in their nature everywhere Messianic. A distinction must, nevertheless, be made between the unconscious prophecies of the sacred singer (which form the highest kind of types, the soul-types), and the conscious prophecies of prophets in the narrower sense. In this psalm, however, the royal singer is actually celebrating the essential, the sinless King, as a personality, who has everlasting reality, and stands as high as heaven above himself; and this is a prophetic impulse in the limited sense, such as there are many in the Psalms.

as it were, only passingly quoted, according to which it was promised Him to be throned at the right hand of the Father in heaven, until all His enemies should be cast down before His feet as at a footstool—those words must now in His mouth be of power as against those enemies who wished to make Him a footstool for the heathen. But even the question suggested to the adversaries that the dignity of the Messiah must overtop the dignity of David; that thus also His authority could not be dependent upon the authority of the Old Testament, still less on *their* authority who administered the Old Testament as judges and interpreters of the law. Yes, this question led them on to the track, that the Messiah must be not only the Son of David, but also the Son of God.

His opponents gave Him no answer to this question. It was characteristic of their gross blindness, that they were incapable of any recognition of the higher dignity and nature of the Messiah. They could not conceive of any Messiah who should take precedence over them; for that reason also, of none who could supersede the Old Testament or David. Thus the word of David that had been quoted was to them a sealed mystery; and with this word, moreover, every other which in a similar way glorified the Messiah; nay, the entire Old Testament, so far as it was to find its key and its explanation in the glory of the Messiah. Thus, therefore, in one great example Christ showed to the Pharisees and the scribes that the Old Testament, and with it also the mystery of the Messiah, is sealed to them by their own fault. With this evidence He broke off the conference with them. According to the Evangelist Mark, a considerable crowd of people rejoiced at these words of the Lord. But the greater part perhaps had no foreboding that Jesus had denounced a judgment of blindness as impending over the greatest part of the nation.[1]

Thus, as Jesus once took his departure from the Galilean Pharisees and scribes, announcing to them the judgments of

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 14. Strauss (i. 648) asserts with reason, against Paulus, that Jesus assumes the 110th Psalm as Messianic, and thinks, moreover, 'that the result, and perhaps also the intention of Jesus, as against the Pharisees, was only to show them that He also could do what they had previously tried to do to Him,—viz., drive them into a corner with captious questions,—and indeed with better result than they.'

God which must come on them on account of their obduracy,[1] so now He separated from the Jewish Pharisees and scribes with a terrible denunciation also. We cannot wonder, as has been already hinted, if in this discourse some features recur which are found in that earlier one. Indeed, this Jewish company of scribes and Pharisees were not contrasted with that Galilean one as a totally different company; for about the feast-time there were many of those very Galileans in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, in most of its elements it was a new and a different company from the former: therefore we cannot wonder if that denunciatory address of Jesus recurs in substance. But as this company presents a determined obstinacy more ripened, more general, more past remedy on the part of the Pharisees and scribes than at their earlier appearance in Galilee, the rebuking word of Jesus is developed into a sevenfold woe upon His adversaries.

Doubtless the words which Mark (xii. 38–40) and Luke (xx. 45–47) record contain the most accurate characters of the Lord's discourse; nevertheless, the extended form of the discourse in Matthew must, perhaps be considered as authentic. For this discourse is like the sermon on the mount, thoroughly original, lively, and historical; it is appropriate to the moment, just as that is. No Evangelist could construct from himself so great a discourse, or venture formally to arrange such an address out of the expressions of Christ.[2]

The Lord's address to the people and to His disciples preceded His denunciation of woe upon the adversaries; and herein He openly declares Himself with respect to them. The scribes and Pharisees, said He, are established in Moses' seat. It is the fact that those people had become lawgivers and judges in the community of Israel. And in that capacity the people ought therefore to acknowledge them. 'All therefore,' says Christ, 'whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.' So far goes the positive injunction. It is plain, on the face of it, that here obedience to the scribes and Pharisees can only be spoken of so far as it does not militate against obedience to the eternal commands of God. All that they deliver to you, *that* keep: thus the holy and eternal word of God before all things. The

[1] II. v. 7.

[2] Olshausen supposes the latter.—*Comment. on Matthew*, iii. 203.

holy Scripture is the tradition of all traditions; therefore the system of tradition must also in its result come back to the point of conforming all other institutions to the holy Scripture. According to this canon Christ stood in relation to the hierarchy.

And thence, therefore, follows at once the negative injunction of the Lord, 'But do not ye after their works: for they say (everything), and do not.' This accusation, that their doings contradict their sayings, the Lord prosecutes with many reproaches. The first goes on: 'They bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.' This reproach might give offence: it might be asked, whether it was not actually zeal for the blessedness of the work for which these men are distinguished. The Lord answers No! For He sees through them. He knows that they are a long way from thinking of the spiritual performance of those requirements which they impose upon others: that thus, for instance, they are widely removed from changing the Sabbath into a purely contemplative celebration of the presence of God; or from trembling or shuddering, according to the meaning of their washings, for every defilement, even the smallest, of daily life. He knows them well, and speaks with confidence. The burdens which they bind on other men, they do not move with a finger, although they would pretend that they do everything. This is precisely the second ground of rebuke. All these works they do to be seen of men. The Lord points out how this love of display strikes the eye. The religious Israelite, by way of literal application of the text, Deut. vi. 8, wears slips of parchment, containing verses of the law, in a sheath on his arm and forehead: these people, however, make their parchments or phylacteries excessively broad. According to the text, Num. xv. 38, the religious Israelite wears on his garment fringes to remind him of his Israelitish calling.[1] These memorials they allow to hang down in heavy tufts. It was intended that all should see how carefully they remember the command of the Lord, how faithfully they are mindful of their Israelitish calling. But their struggles prove that this love of

[1] The fringes which they were to fasten to the wings of their garments were to be fastened with blue cord. Thus perhaps the varied play of their affections and thoughts was to be restrained by the blue cord of the divine revelation and of the faithfulness of Israel.

display is animated with a burning ambition; this is described by the Lord also. They wish to usurp all the honours, however various, of every position and every condition, it might almost be said of every faculty; they wish to take possession for themselves of the first place of honour at the banquets, the first master's chair in the syngogues, and the first respect at the market; they demand for themselves all courtesies and all greetings; they wished to be hailed by men as Rabbi! Rabbi!

When the Lord has depicted this hypocritical ambition, He makes an application of it for the benefit of His disciples.

As members of His community, on the pure New Testament ground of the kingdom of God, where the training of the child ceases, they were not to be called Rabbi, but to establish it firmly that only One is their Master, and they are all brethren one with another. They were therefore also to call none among them their father[1] (in a similar sense in the arrangement of the church life), since they have only one Father in a spiritual sense—the Father in heaven. Moreover, they were not, thirdly, in any way, either by lowering or altering their pretensions, to wish to be called leaders of the congregation (heads of a creed or of a sect); for one is the leader of the people, even Christ. Hereupon follow the earnest admonitions which we have already considered above. He that is greatest among you shall be your servant (Matt. xx. 26, 27). Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted (Luke xiv. 11). This word is here to be considered as the special motto of the denunciation against the scribes and Pharisees, which the Lord now, in a sevenfold woe, which is concentrated in the eighth, directs immediately upon them, always again and again accosting them as hypocrites.

The first woe He proclaims over them, because, by their exclusiveness in the nature of their institutions, they shut up from the people the kingdom of heaven, as the kingdom of the essential, the real, and free, and blessed life of the Spirit.[2] They them-

[1] The change of expression is here very significant, and can perhaps only be explained on the supposition that not many would lay claim to the name of father in a spiritual sense, but that many might wish mistakenly to apply it to a person.

[2] In many codices, and by critical authorities, the transposition of the usual order of vers. 13 and 14 is recommended; but the received order is supported not only by other reasons, but especially also by the course of

selves do not go out of the fore-court of types into the true spiritual temple of the kingdom of God; and they do not suffer it, if others should wish to enter. In this dead formality, they throw away the key of living knowledge; and stamp him as a criminal who again seeks and keeps it, in the true desire for inner spiritual life.

The second woe He denounces upon their sanctimonious covetousness—that they, with their heartless formality, extort from pious but credulous natures immense donations to the temple-chest. They devour widows' houses. Moreover, long prayers are their pretence, with which they appear to bless everything, to be willing to rescue everything from the fire of judgment. Therefore, says the Lord, on that very account, ye shall receive the greater damnation.

The third woe comes upon them because of their mischievous proselytizing. They encompass, as if in a hunter's circle, the sea and the land, in order to make *one* proselyte; and when he is made, they make him a child of hell, who in his blind fanaticism goes even far beyond themselves, and becomes twofold worthy of condemnation.

The fourth woe comes on them because of their mean casuistry, because of the ruinous distinctions in their spoiled religious doctrine and morality, by which they are characterized as blind guides of souls. This judgment is confirmed by an example. They teach that whosoever should swear by the temple, he is not bound thereby; but that he is, if he should swear by the gold in the temple. In the same way, they explain an oath by the altar as unimportant; but the oath by the gift on the altar, as creating an obligation. Indignantly the Lord inveighs against them as fools and blind, on account of their wretched distinctions. He shows to them that it is strictly the temple which sanctifies the gold in the temple; the altar which gives to the offering upon it its sacredness. They have thus made diametrically wrong definitions. Then the Lord proves to them that these distinctions are altogether futile, and leading to error, by the observation that he who swears by the altar swears at the same time by all which is thereon; and that he who swears

thought. It is the beginning of the pharisaic ruin, that its representatives close the actual kingdom of heaven to themselves and others, in order to continue in the typical vision.

by the temple swears also by Him who dwelleth in the temple; and that He who swears by heaven, swears by the throne of God, and by Him who sitteth on that throne. Thus He shows that even those oaths in which we are more or less prone to treat the law of truthfulness slightingly, are yet, if we attend to their peculiar significance, manifested at last as oaths by God: thus one with another as closely binding, strictly responsible oaths. And thus therefore all duties are in harmony with the one highest duty, although the casuists with their distinctions enfeeble many duties, and so lay the foundation of a real withering away of the sense of duty in the minds of their pupils.

The fifth woe is denounced upon the hypocritical petty legalism with which they conceal from themselves and others their wanton disregard of the everlasting commandments of God. They discharge very punctually the tenth for the temple,—of mint, and of anise, and of cummin; but they let slip the weightier and more difficult demands of the law—judgment (true living righteousness especially, as applied to self-judgment in repentance), and mercy, and faith. But these things, thus teaches the Lord, ought to stand in the foreground: these things ought to be done; and therewith also those things, those punctiliousnesses of legalism, ought not to be neglected. On account of this perversity, He casts upon them the reproach that they are like to such men as strain through their drink, in order that they may swallow with it no gnat, but in spite of their carefulness negligently swallow down a camel.

The sixth woe falls on them because of their sinful luxury, which they seek to disguise by the hypocritical appearance of great sanctity in their enjoyments. They keep the outside of their cups and platters—that is, the outside of their life of sense—clean and pure, according to an exaggeration of the ordinances of Levitical purity; but the inside of their table vessels is full of robbery and gluttony; their acquisitions, as their enjoyments, are sinful, wild, and ruinous. To this is added the warning, 'Cleanse first the inside of the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Sanctify your gains and your enjoyments, in order to consecrate your life of sense, and to set it forth in its due honour.'

The seventh woe represents every curse already named in its root and in its fruit; in its external sanctimoniousness,

appearances of life, glitter of life; in its internal ruin, death, and decay of corruption. 'Ye are like,' says Christ, 'unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even so,' He adds, 'ye also appear outwardly righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.'

Hereupon the Lord, in an eighth woe, declares the historical and polemical side of their undoing—their hatred against the true spiritual life, which is manifested in the persecution of the prophets. In this woe there appears again, therefore, the historic effect and form of all their earlier perversities. It is a seven-fold woe in one—the curse of their imperishable hatred against the prophets: they build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. 'Wherefore,' says He, 'ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets (to wit, thoroughly blinded self-righteous men as they were); and ye shall fill up therefore the measure of your fathers.' The concluding word goes on—'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? *Upon that very account*,' says He now, in the everlasting consciousness of His divine nature, before which time and space disappear, 'behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.' We have above considered the peculiar difficulty of this passage.[1] Its meaning is this: The judgment of the obduracy of Pharisees and scribes in Israel advanced further and further from generation to generation, and from guilt to guilt,[2] and could cease no more until it was fulfilled in the most fearful judgment upon the most enormous guilt. The Lord shows to His opponents that this doom is impending over them.

He thus appears to hint at the ninth and last woe. But this He does not express. Perhaps He does not express it because

[1] II. v. 7, note 2. [2] Stier, iii. 233.

in His death, in which the guilt of the Pharisees and scribes was fulfilled, the atonement surpasses the judgment. And thus in this terrible denunciation of the Lord we number one woe less than we number of beatitudes in His sermon on the mount. But it is none the less plain that this announcement of judgment stands in internal connection with that announcement of the Gospel.[1] He had already contrasted the righteousness of His people whom He blessed in His beatitudes, with the righteousness of the Pharisees and scribes; and as He represents the ascent of the truly pious towards the blessed state, so He represents the descent of the seemingly pious to destruction. This destruction He has here described in its development. Thus it is obvious to look for a parallel between the sermon on the mount and this denunciation.

It is the beginning of the parallelism, that the blessedness of true poverty of spirit, to which the kingdom of heaven is appropriated, is contrasted with the unblessedness of an external legal service, whose representatives shut up the kingdom of heaven, of the true spiritual life, from themselves and from others also.

The second beatitude blesses those that mourn, who painfully long for the true life, for the entry into the kingdom of heaven, which they have lost. The second woe, on the other hand, represents those heartless hypocrites whose longing is no holy mournfulness, but an unholy covetousness, in which they devour widows' houses, blinding and enchaining these true mourners with their long prayers, instead of truly comforting them.

The third beatitude blesses the meek, and assures to them the possession of the earth. The third denunciation of woe, on the other hand, falls upon the fanatical proselytizers who rush through land and sea to win proselytes, although they do not thereby extend the glory of the kingdom of God on the earth, or win the true inheritance of the earth, but rather destroy themselves and others.

[1] Olshausen, iii. 204. In both of these great discourses is represented an act of Christ's judicial work: in the sermon on the mount, its manifestation of blessing; in the anti-pharisaic discourse, of judgment. [So also Riggenbach (*Vorlesungen*, p. 598): 'There, with blessing on blessing, He allures to Himself all who were anxious to enter the kingdom of heaven through a better righteousness than that of the Pharisees. Here He heaps woe on woe upon the hypocritically righteous, who themselves remained outside, and would not that others should enter.'—ED.]

The fourth beatitude blesses those who hunger and thirst after true righteousness, and gives them the promise that they shall be filled. How awfully sharp is the contrast between this blessing and the fourth woe, which proceeds from the dead-born false show of righteousness, expressing itself in the assertion of a casuistic morality, by which it is continually reproduced!

The fifth beatitude is addressed to the merciful; they shall obtain mercy. But it is altogether the contrary with those who incur the fifth woe by despising that which is important in the law—judgment, and mercy, and faith, while in a paltry manner they seek for life in petty punctilios of tithe-due.

The blessed of the sixth beatitude are those who are of a pure heart. Their promise is—they shall see God. With them the denunciation of Jesus contrasts those seemingly pure ones who draw upon themselves the sixth woe, because they make clean the outside of their cups and platters, while their inner life is defiled by wicked gain and sensual conduct.

The seventh beatitude represents the children of God in the loftier choir; those heroes of love and of the Spirit who attain the title of God's children because they manifest themselves on earth as the peacemakers—because they diffuse upon earth, with the peace of God, light, life, and joy. The gloomy contrast to them is formed by the whited sepulchres in their woe. They glisten like abodes of peace; but they are filled with the decay of death, and could not enliven, but only diffuse the odour of death.

Thus to the sevenfold beatitude there is a sevenfold woe as counterpart. But now we have seen above, in the consideration of the sermon on the mount, that in the eighth and ninth beatitudes the seven blessings are once more represented again in their historical form, according to the relation of the faithful to the world and to the Lord. And thus it is here also with the woe that surpasses the seventh.

The pious are blessed if they are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. The seemingly pious are unblessed, because they know no other way of reverencing righteousness than by adorning the graves of the righteous slaughtered in former times; while they themselves are manifested as blinded, self-righteous persecutors of the righteous.

In the ninth and last beatitude, the Lord blesses His people,

because for His sake they are reviled and persecuted; and cries to them, Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven.

He has contrasted this beatitude with no woe. For all the blood of slain martyrs, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, has cried more or less for vengeance to heaven, and the great doom is thereby brought near; that the enemies put Him to death. But the blood of Christ speaketh better things than the blood of Abel. Therefore He does not express the ninth woe. Rather, instead of it, He breaks forth in the words: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!'

The guilt of the scribes and Pharisees appears now to the Lord as a guilt of Jerusalem; and thus therefore, moreover, as a national crime. For Jerusalem is the supporter of the pharisaic tendency, and the representative of the spirit of the people. It is the living centre, the earthly hearth of the theocratic people. But if the prevailing spirit of the people is represented to Him now in the form of Jerusalem, it results that there is awakened in His mind now sympathy for His people in its full strength.

Jerusalem represents the life and the honour, the ancestry and the pride, the youth and the hope of the nation. Jerusalem represents the children of the people, as they had often been threatened with terrible storms, and now are threatened by the most dreadful world-storm. Therefore He laments and mourns over His Jerusalem. All God's messages which have come to Jerusalem, and which He has before designated as messages of righteousness, by which the judgment of Israel must be accomplished, appear to Him now more than ever as God's endeavours to deliver Jerusalem. In all the efforts of the messengers, the life-impulse of His Spirit, of His saving mercy, was already at work. But especially it was engaged in all His own special labours. Yea, in all His historical pilgrimage and ministry, there was a sorrow, an anguish for Jerusalem, such as a hen feels for her chickens when threatened by an enemy.[1]

[1] Stier, iii. 247, observes ingeniously how Jehovah, in His dealing with His people, represents Himself at first as an eagle (Deut. xxxii. 11) flutter-

The hen sees the bird of prey in the air, and seeks with anxiety to gather her brood together. Even thus Jesus saw the Roman eagle hover for judgment over the children of Jerusalem, and sought to deliver them with the most earnest allurements of His love. In vain! They treated the voice of maternal love as if they had been dead children. And thus they behaved, even now, at the last appeal of pity.

That is the wretchedness of Jerusalem, as the Lord, the real true King of the city, feels it in His faithful heart, and expresses it in the most earnest lamentation. But the wretchedness of Jerusalem is, moreover, the guilt of Jerusalem. And this guilt is especially a crime of those who resisted Jesus in the character of His deadly enemies,—a crime which He must now again consider, which He must express in words—Ye would not!

'Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.' That is the judgment upon the temple.[1] He departs now from the temple, in heart, in spirit, and in purpose, and then the temple incurred its doom—the glory of the Lord dwells no longer therein. Henceforth it is a profaned house, yea, a fallen city, a ruin!

But still Jesus could not, even now, announce to His people a hopeless sorrow. Once more the voice of pity is lifted up to hail a bright morning glow behind the long stormy night: 'I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.'[2]

The Jews, as Jews, were no more to behold in their temple and ceremonial any trace of the true historical Messiah, until at a future time they turned to Him—until the jubilee of the repentant people cries to Him welcome, and acknowledges that

ing over her young and bearing them on her wings, and then as a hen which spreads abroad her wings over the chickens. This is the contrast between the governing, educating love, and the enduring, delivering love.

[1] Comp. Hess, iii. 109. He observes, on this exclamation of Jesus, 'Words to which even that fruitless attempt of the Cæsar Julian to rebuild the temple, and all its subsequent destiny, have set the seal.' Compare also Rauschenbusch, *das Leben Jesu*, 327.

[2] Sepp makes the judicious remark: 'The chief priests, scribes, and elders of the people were bound to return the greeting to Him at the call of the children, Hosanna to the son of David, on the day of the palm-entry into the temple, and are still bound to it until this hour: therefore their house is left desolate, and the countenance of the Highest has not again turned towards His people even to this hour' (iii. 314).

He comes to them in the name, in the word, in the power, in the commission, and in the Spirit of their ancient covenant God, Jehovah![1]

The Lord had thus taken His departure from the temple—with no pathetic excitement, however, but with the deepest tranquillity of spirit, although with the most sorrowful feeling. He no more hurried away from the temple now, than He subsequently hurried away from the grave when He awakened to new life. There He first placed the grave-clothes in order, and laid them on one side quietly; and here He sat down for a little time in the fore-court of the women, opposite to the boxes for offerings which belonged to the temple treasury;[2] and considered the people as they flowed by and cast their alms into the treasury of God. He beheld how many rich people flocked near, and cast in large gifts. Then He beheld also a poor widow come, who cast in two mites, which made together a quadrant, or penny.[3] This circumstance, apparently so trifling, induced Him to call His disciples together. 'Verily I say unto you,' said He, 'That this poor widow hath cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury. For all they did cast in of their abundance: but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living.'

It has been observed, with reason, that this history is directly intended to confirm the rebuke of Jesus against the scribes and Pharisees, that they devoured the widows' houses. It was seen, in an example, how grievously the spirits of the pious in the land were goaded and pressed by the fathers of the people to offer to the treasury everything which they thought they could in any way dispense with; while the rich, and among them also the Pharisees and scribes, made themselves very comfortable with their offerings.

[1] Stier, iii. 243.

[2] On the γαζοφυλάκιον, see Ebrard, 385. Probably not only the porch, where the special treasury of the temple was, but, in a wider sense, the porch also in which the boxes for offerings was placed, was indicated by the name in question.

[3] 'She had put in two lepta, or one quadrant. One lepton, perhaps, was given to a beggar, but less than two could not be cast into the alms-box: it was the smallest offering.'—Sepp, iii. 311. See also, upon the Jewish coins, the same author.

This trait, however, shows us at once the profoundly calm, tranquil state of mind—the heavenly transparency of feeling—with which Christ took His departure from the temple. As a holy stranger, as a considerate traveller from a higher world, He might sit down opposite the alms-chest, and consider that kind of offering in which the superstition of His people was at that time concentrated. He looks on the alms of the people with penetrating eye; that is the testimony of His heavenly candour. The two mites of the widow do not escape Him; that is the master-glance of love. He acknowledges in her unmeasured, almost foolish effort to support the treasury of God with her last very small means, the pious intention, the pure purpose, the offering of the heart which is given to God. This is the glance of heavenly truth. He estimates the gift of this woman, in respect of the showy gifts of money which so many rich people brought, and decides that the woman has given most of all, because she has brought, not of her superfluity, but of her want, what she offered. That is the voice of equity. Moreover, therein is expressed the eternal freshness, vivacity, and power of that perfect faithfulness to His vocation, which is identical with the pulse of the pure heart—that He is now disposed, in this frame of mind, and in this aspect of affairs, to discourse once more to His disciples upon this text, 'The poor widow's two mites,'—a discourse, indeed, which has wrought blessing in His Church a thousandfold, and will work blessing even to the end of the world. But that with this inoffensive and affectionate discourse He should take leave of their temple concerns, from which He beholds Himself thrust by obdurate spirits—in this is revealed the Reconciler of the world, as also the sin of the world in their religious condition. Had the Reformers been able, in such an exalted disposition towards their times, to separate from the typical temple concerns of that day, the Reformation would have been completed in richer measure.

The look of the Lord, which recognised the pure flame of piety in that widow, in the midst of the smoke of her own superstition, and in the fume and vapour of hypocrisy that was around her, assures us that the Lord sees all the greater and lesser lights of sacrificing love which faithful and pious hearts kindle to their God in every place. Therefore such offerings,

in the proportion of their inner value, are not lost, even although the external alms which fall into the treasury of a form of worship alienated from the spirit, go with that form of worship to ruin. The foolish confidence of the poor widow in the nature of the temple, upon which her piety reposed, is penetrated by the higher confidence with which she surrenders her last means of widowhood to the God of her life.

But it is perhaps a leading feature in this beautiful representation of character, that Christ separates from the temple with one warm glance of blessing upon true piety in the old temple service.

The disciples, on the going forth from the temple, appeared to appreciate the gravity of the moment deeply. When they came to the point of leaving the temple, they seemed to be unable to separate themselves from it. It looked like a mournful intercession, that they were so urgent now in calling the Lord's attention to the glory of the temple. Possibly, also, this state of mind is penetrated by the doubt, whether it is possible that the Lord, with His interests, will separate Himself from this mighty edifice, and from the religious commonwealth supported by it, and will be able to establish a victorious Church of God outside of this house, and separate from it. The thought would fall on them very painfully, that they were not to discover in this temple the visible eternal centre of the kingdom of heaven that had been announced to them. One among them gave expression to this feeling. According to Mark, he called attention especially to the immense masses of stone, to the imposing character of the building—how it appeared to be founded for eternity. Luke relates, that others pointed to the adorning of the temple, how it was erected of beautiful stones—how its white blocks of marble glistened—and how, over and above, the gorgeous gifts[1] with which it was endowed glorified it. Others, according to Matthew, might especially point out to Him the buildings, so far as the temple was still in process of building, and not yet altogether completed.[2] They seemed to wish to say to Him in every way, that the temple appeared still to have an important future; that a house of God, so strongly founded, still scarcely completed, glittering afar through the land, from

[1] On these votive gifts, see Sepp, iii. 314.

[2] Winer, Art. Temple.

its temple mountain, like a white mountain of snow, yea, a house of God, which, for aught that appeared, even many eminent heathens had designated with their gifts, as the peculiar temple around which the Gentiles would assemble.

Thus the Lord beheld Himself surrounded by a band of enthusiastic temple-worshippers, in His disciples, who seemed to Him to extol the fabric as an imperishable house of God, or to speak in favour of its destiny. But these lively expressions of this company could not mislead Him. He answered them with a wondrously earnest and strong word: 'See ye not (see ye not indeed[1]) all these things?' It seems as if all would, before His prophetic look, at once crumble together, fall and disappear, like a vision of the ancient glory of Zion! Do ye indeed see all this still? O Spirit-glance, which beholds deserts where the common eye of sense still sees the proudest structures of pomp, but which can also perceive a paradise where others can still only vouch for a desert, or the place of skulls! Then He adds, 'Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.'

NOTES.

1. Even although it cannot be authenticated that the Sadducees rejected the later writings of the Old Testament,—to wit, the prophetic books,—yet the inference may be gathered, not only from the place of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 10, 6), but especially also from the foregoing interview itself, from the form and manner in which the Pharisees argue against Jesus, and He argues against them, from the books of Moses—the inference that they must have attached a higher value to the *Thora* than to the later Old Testament writings.

2. The explanation of De Wette (*Matth.* 188) and of Weisse (i. 168), according to which Jesus might have wished here to set aside the notion that the Messiah is the son of David, as an erroneous one, needs here only to be mentioned.

[1] The οὐ in Matthew, from internal evidence, must probably be the right reading. It brings out the word of the Lord just in its entire significance.

SECTION VII.

THE RETROSPECT OF JESUS ON THE TEMPLE, FROM THE TOP OF THE MOUNT OF OLIVES, SURROUNDED BY HIS CONFIDENTIAL DISCIPLES. THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE JUDGMENT OF GOD, OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE HOLY CITY AND OF THE TEMPLE, AS WELL AS OF THE END OF THE WORLD. THE PARABLES OF THE TEN VIRGINS AND OF THE TALENTS. THE JUDGMENT OF THE WORLD—WATCH!

(Matt. xxiv. 3–xxv. 46; Mark xiii. 3–37; Luke xxi. 7–36.)

It was already perhaps about eventide, when the Lord, with His disciples, left Jerusalem to travel the accustomed road over the Mount of Olives to Bethany, for He had done a very heavy day's work. But when He had arrived at the Mount of Olives, He casts one more lingering look back on poor Jerusalem. It was as if He could no more; as though it would have been impossible to Him to pass beyond the crest of the Mount of Olives immediately—at once to lose from His sight the beloved city. Upon the declivity on this side, He sate down directly opposite to the temple. Probably the sun was just setting, perhaps it had already disappeared. And there He sate, in the evening twilight, His gaze resting on the city; on the temple, the object of so many wishes and benedictions; on the holy place, which had been to Him the dearest on earth, but which now He saw doomed to judgment.

But grief did not cloud the clearness of His Spirit; it only gave to His gaze the more intense direction upon the future of Jerusalem, to the judgments which were to come upon the city. And in the doom of Jerusalem He saw the type and foreshadow of all the judgments which should come upon the people of God, and upon humanity, even to the last judgment. He was now in the position of a great seer of the future judgments of God; and this foresight He would leave in its large outlines as an inheritance to His people.

Here in view of the holy city and of the temple, over which

[1] [On the pathos and moral effect generally of the local situation of the speaker, and the parties addressed in this discourse, see Greswell, *On the Parables*, v. 420.—Ed.]

59194

the night was falling, He would communicate to His disciples the outlines of the coming judgments.

Probably, indeed, He knew that in so doing He was anticipating their own eager wish. The disciples must have some new information about the future, for the last disclosure of their Master had effected a great disturbance in their theocratic view of the world. The image of the future of the Messianic age, as they had constructed it for themselves, was shattered. They now were without any knowledge of their probable relation to the future, and they needed new information.

As simple Old Testament believers, they had until now expected that, with the manifestation of the Messiah, which they themselves had just hailed, and of which they had been the heralds, would be very soon associated the revelation of His glory,—the extension of His kingdom,—the glorification of Zion,—the judgment of the world; and therewith the end of the old order of things,—the beginning of a new world.

It is true they might, as pious readers of the Old Testament, have been in some measure familiar with the idea of the suffering Messiah. For although we learn from the Gospels, how much the knowledge or the right understanding of the prophets fell short in the time of Christ, still the prophecy of the old Simeon was a proof that it had not altogether failed. Added to this, Christ had predicted His sufferings and His death in so definite a manner. But we have already seen with how little of simple resignation they could appropriate to themselves this prediction. And if they at all received the idea of their Lord's death into their view of the future, the announcement of His resurrection on the third day nevertheless induced them somehow to hope for some wonderful turn of a happy kind soon to occur. Yet this hope had little power to support them at the time of Christ's crucifixion.

Moreover, they might indeed have known from the prophet Daniel also (chap. ix. 26), of a doom of destruction which impended over the city of Jerusalem and the temple in the days of the Messiah, and in connection with His sufferings; but the Evangelic history shows us how little the Israelites of that day had taken up into their practical view of things around them the threatening prophecies of this nature.

This much is evident from the earnest inquiry of the dis-

ciples, that the coming destruction of Jerusalem which the Lord predicted to them was something new to them, which extremely disturbed and disquieted their hearts.[1] In every case they had probably pictured to themselves the sad intervening circumstances between the first appearance of their Lord and His glorification on Zion, as passing over quickly. But now they had received from Him the definite assurance that the temple must fall into ruins, Jerusalem be destroyed, her people undergo a terrible doom of reprobation. Therewith, before their eyes, had been opened a deep and fearful gulf which tore wide asunder the events of Christ's present manifestation from His coming glorification; a gulf which formed itself into a yawning abyss, in whose depths they saw nothing but judgment, calamity, and destruction, and in which even their hopes were in danger of being swallowed up. That was their difficulty, the great and terrible chasm between the first and second appearing of the Messiah—a chasm which was now certain to them. We might easily apprehend how this heavy intervening time would distress them, since it has been a temptation to Christians at all times,—a dark valley which many have sought to fill up and to hide by chiliastic schemes, chimeras, and systems;[2] while others preferred to abandon the expectation of Christ's coming altogether, which they melted away into spiritualistic ideas.

It was now, therefore, certain to the disciples that they had to separate between the present manifestation of Christ and His future return to His glorification, with which the judgment upon the world and the end of the world were associated; and that the destruction of Jerusalem was to occur in the interval. But they were altogether in uncertainty when that destruction was to happen, in what relation it was to stand to the end of the world, (or the second advent of Christ), and especially, whether they were to regard the destruction of Jerusalem as the sign of the judgment of the world or not. Hereupon they desired to have an explanation from the Lord.

[1] The remark of Ebrard, 'Thus also the prediction of the suffering of Jesus was an impulse which complicated all their previous eschatological conceptions, and, as it were, dislocated their whole scheme,' is therefore so far to be modified, as that this complication was first effected by the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem.

[2] To which especially belongs the completed curialistic Papacy.

We learn from the Evangelist Mark, that the three most confidential disciples of Jesus—Peter, James, and John, to whom on this occasion was joined Andrew—put before Him the question which occupied their minds. But they asked Him with an air of circumspection, in a confidential manner. How are we to understand this, since the Lord already had found Himself so nearly alone on the Mount of Olives with His disciples in the stillness of evening? We can hardly suppose that He separated those confidential ones from the rest, and entrusted to them alone the communication—as He had once separated the three first in the explanation—that He was purposing. In that case it might be expected that He would have separated only the same three disciples again; and at the same time, that the rest of the Evangelists would have mentioned this circumstance. The mysterious and confidential form, as it was used here on the mountain at eventide, must probably have had its peculiar reasons. Perhaps the Lord was anxious that the traitor should not be near them during their conversation. Perhaps, also, there were other disciples or other friends, who were sent in advance to Bethany. But, at any rate, we apprehend that the disciples, even in the solitude of the Mount of Olives, even in the shadow of evening twilight, could scarcely speak above a whisper of the impending destruction of the holy city and of the temple.

The narrative which the three first Evangelists, especially Matthew, have given of the discourse of the Lord upon the last things, has been not only found in many ways very obscure, but will more often be found also intricate and contradictory. Many later interpreters and critics have thought that they have met with certain chiliastic errors here, which they would willingly, even with reference to other places, charge upon the disciples, or even upon the Lord Himself.[1]

As regards the narratives of the three Evangelists, it will result from the representation of this subject, that they entirely agree with one another in the outlines, but they supplement one another in the details. From this we gain confirmation of the supposition, which besides for us is already established, that they have communicated in their accounts, not only individual and peculiar views, but the special teaching of the Lord. But it also results from the question of the disciples, as the Evangelists cite

[1] Compare the statement in Ebrard, 389.

it, that their chiliastic suppositions, which have been charged on them in their later position, were already altogether shaken by the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem. They ask, 'When shall these things be? and what is the sign of this manifestation, and of the end (the consummation) of the world?' They thus not only distinguish between the destruction of Jerusalem and the second coming of Christ to the final judgment; but, at the same time, they give it plainly to be understood, that they do not consider it certain that the destruction of Jerusalem will be the sign of the impending end of the world. Indeed, it just as much follows from the question, that they are not yet convinced of the contrary, especially when we look back to the position of their question in Mark and Luke; so also the answer of the Lord, which not only specifies to them the sign of the approaching end of the world, but also the sign of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. Their question is just as wavering and uncertain as their present position; the answer of the Lord, for the first time, gives them a true light upon it.[1]

In reference to the relation of the four Evangelists to the discourses of Jesus of the last things, it is well worthy of consideration, that John has recorded nothing of them in the Gospel.[2] We have already on another occasion called attention to the fact that this omission may be explained by the circumstance that the Apostle would reserve to a special Apocalypse the disclosures of the Lord on the last things.[3] Moreover, the comparison of this discourse of Jesus with the Apocalypse affords us more than one service. It teaches us, for instance, first of all to consider this discourse as the special life-germ of the New Testament Apocalypse. Moreover, it teaches us to estimate the apostolic character of the eschatology of the Apocalypse, finding as we do similar features in the apostolic history. But, finally, our attention is called by the Apocalypse to a circumstance which

[1] Stier, iii. 244. There is thus no good reason for making two sharply distinct questions out of their question.

[2] Stier (ii. 539, iii. 244) makes the sensible remark, that John had it as his peculiar esoteric privilege to record the sayings of Jesus of His coming to comfort; while, on the other hand, the Synoptists had to record the prediction of the Lord of His coming to judge.

[3] See, in the author's miscellaneous writings, vol. ii., the treatise on the indissoluble connection between the individuality of the Apostle John and that of the Apocalypse, 181.

is of the highest importance to the elucidation of this place. This is the fact that the Apocalypse represents the course of the world's history, not in an unbroken sequence of events, but in large cycles, which always embrace the entire course of the world, while therein each cycle is drawing nearer to the end of the world.[1] If this mode of representation had been recognised, here also this much discussed portion of Scripture would have been more easily relieved of many difficulties.

It is not to be denied that the prophecy of judgment as declared by Jesus—here as well as in the prophets—is treated perspectively; that is to say, that the judgment of God is represented in one large comprehensive picture upon Jerusalem, in connection with the future judgment of the world, and the former forms the foreground of the latter.[2] Moreover, this explains how the great interval between the destruction of Jerusalem and the world's end, as it is sketched in Matt. xxiv. 22–26, not only strikes one very little, but also is represented definitely—under the point of sight of the judicial government of God, so to speak—in the twofold reflection of the flames of Jerusalem, and of the judgment at the end of the world.

It is thereby at once decided that in this representation there must be something typical. The destruction of Jerusalem must be in conformity with its nature, and therefore also, in conformity with this representation, a prelude of the second advent of Christ, of the last judgment, and of the end of the world. Nay, according to strict historical accuracy, the judgment upon Jerusalem must of necessity bring about the last judgment and the end of the world: only grace modifies this doom (for the elect's sake, these days of terror shall be shortened,

1 Compare the above-mentioned treatise.

2 Stier, iii. 249. On the origin of the opinion of the perspective view, see Dorner, *de oratione Christi eschatologica*, 35. [See Fairbairn's instructive chapter on the interconnected and progressive character of prophecy (*Prophecy viewed in its Distinctive Nature*, etc., c. vi.), and the remarks of Greswell (*Parables*, v. 198 ff.) on the interpretation of this prophecy of our Lord's. He says (223), 'One observation is very necessary to be made, and to be kept in view throughout: that the events predicted being regarded in the light of signs, bearing a special reference to a certain point of time before and after the period of their occurrence, it is the *first* instance of such events with which we are properly concerned, and not such repetitions of the same as might occur again from time to time afterwards.'—Ed.]

Matt. xxiv. 22). And there occurs still an intervening period between the two great epochs of doom. But, strictly, such a characterization of this period suggests that the destruction of Jerusalem was the judgment of the world, preliminary, and interrupted by grace; and, on the other hand, that the last judgment is the continuation and fulfilment of that theocratic judgment of God which began with the destruction of Jerusalem.

If, however, the perspective and typical elements in the prophecy of Christ be brought into prominence, so as to melt their several expressions into one another, in a similar way to that in which perhaps they might melt together in Old Testament prophecies—this is altogether inadmissible. First of all, upon the general ground that Christ is a Seer, not in the concrete manner of visionary insight, and describes what He sees not in the way of ecstacy, which must neglect time and place; but in the completed knowledge, consciousness, and power of one who can modify the results.[1] Then, moreover, because in this case there was required, not only for the questioning disciples, but also for the Lord who answered them, above all things, an accurate, even a sharp definition of the periods.[2]

First of all, the Lord gives to the disciples an accurate picture of the destiny of His people in their relation to the course of the world, even to the world's end,—a picture of the future of the world and of the Church as His future in the outlines which they for the most part needed. This is the first cycle (Matt. xxiv. 4–14; Mark xiii. 5–13; Luke xxi. 8–19).

The disciples had inquired of Him the times and the signs of the last things. The times and the signs were to them, in accordance with their more external, nay, chiliastic interest, the chief concern. Thus the answer of Christ, His first word as well as His first explanation, establishes a sharp contrast to the external interest of the question: '*Take heed that no man deceive you,*' especially lead you wrong just in respect of those signs

[1] Not exclusively τῷ πνεύματι; but just as much, τῷ νοΐ.

[2] Dorner brings this out with reason and force in the above cited treatise, 9. Ebrard also, in the treatise, *Adversus erroneam nonnullorum opinionem qua Christus, Christique apostoli judaicis somniis decepti existumasse perhibentur fore ut universale judicium ipsorum ætate superveniret*, 7.

and times. According to the view of the Lord, that is the chief point in the eschatological knowledge of His disciples—the foresight in the presentiment that many deceivers shall arise, but not the knowledge of external times and signs. Hence the holy suspense and concentration of mind in the presentiment that great risks and great deceits awaited the Christian at his entrance into a wide futurity, and that great sobriety of spirit, clear eye, and earnest hand must be his watchwords.

Hereupon Christ sketches the outlines of the world's course up to His advent. The entire description embraces in the consideration of the world's course,—the history of the nations, with the history of His kingdom,—the history of humanity, with the history of the earth and its world. It presupposes, as the point of commencement of the development of this world-system, the first manifestation of Christ. From this distinctive point of life, the world progresses in its development towards the future end of the world, with which the transformation of the world is to appear. This development is represented in two lines—in a more tranquil one which forms the foreground, and in a more tempestuous one which forms the background. The first shows in the more customary signs that the Church, humanity, and the earth, are advancing towards the end. The second sets forth, in large and startling vicissitudes, the birth-pains of the last times. Moreover, each line of view has two sides, a Christologic and a cosmic one.

That is the Christologic side of the first line in the world's career, that many come in the name of Christ, and say, I am Christ, and the time of the consummation of the world is at hand (Luke xxi. 8); and many allow themselves to be deceived and misled by them. Here is indicated every form of chiliasm, making itself known in false Messiahs, in false representatives of Christ, in heads of sects and pretended infallible philosophers, —making itself known generally in all religious, political, and philosophical schools and systems, which seek to declare the consummation of the world. To this excitement in the kingdom of spirits, which reveals that humanity is possessed with the thought of the coming of Christ to renew the world, is opposed the cosmic side of the progress: wars and rumours of wars, which, incessantly breeding themselves anew, cause their din to resound from the armies of the nations into the camp of the con-

gregation; wars, to which, according to Luke, insurrections are added. It is thus plainly acknowledged that humanity is in movement, and the Church is in movement, and that the one line of progress must stand in mysterious *rapport* with the other. It is plain, moreover, that the course of the world is in progress towards the end of the world. But Christians are not to allow themselves to be disturbed, as if the end were immediately: they are to look calmly upon the world's wars, and not allow themselves to be startled; just as they are sharply to watch the false forms of Christ, and not to allow themselves to be led away. 'The end,' says Christ, 'is not yet'—is not immediately at hand.

The Christological development of the world is a development as high as heaven, profound, penetrating beyond the boundary of humanity, of the earth, and of the whole of this present cosmos; therefore it is a slow development.

In the second stadium, the world-crisis is represented as tempestuous; its pulses beat more hurriedly and impetuously. Here the Lord brings out, first of all, the cosmologic side. One people lifts itself up against the other; one kingdom against the other. Humanity is in a storm of excitement, as the waves of the sea beat against one another in the tempest. And now it is manifest that nature and the earth have a deep sympathy with humanity in this process of development. There appear famines, in which the distempered earth is wanting to man; pestilences, in which distempered man is wanting to the earth (λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ); great storms and earthquakes from place to place; fearful phenomena and great signs in heaven (Luke xxi. 11). According to the word of the Lord, these facts are to be regarded as the beginning of sorrows (ὠδίνων), of the labour-throes of the old world-form. They show, not only that in the mighty progress earthly nature is engaged in a parallel movement with humanity, but they represent the accelerated movement of this progress, in which one spasm follows on the other. Therewith also corresponds the increased distress in the Christologic development of the world's course. Christians are delivered over to affliction,—they are outlawed and excommunicated,—they are put to death. They are hated of all people for Christ's name's sake. Moreover, while they are thus externally afflicted, the congregation is also disturbed within. The matter originates thus:—That many are offended with one another; that they

are exasperated with real and fancied grievances; that they are degenerate, and so lose their character as Christians. Then matters become worse: they deliver one another up, whether by giving one another bad names before the earthly adversaries, and putting one another to shame; or that, by fanatical excommunications, they give one another over to Satan. The result is, that they hate one another. Faith-hatred, creed-hatred, party-hatred, opinion-hatred, individual hatred, more public manifestations of darkness, which contradict the very root of faith and of creed, as well as the definition of Christian fellowship, of Christian individuality and conviction. But while thus, on the one side, there is abundant ill-feeling in the appearance of Church fellowship, under the pretext of offences given, the false prophets oppose themselves as antagonists to the deteriorated nature of the Church, as it appears in its obscured forms of life: who are appointed for judgment, and themselves again become liable to judgment; erroneous preachers of novelty, new preachers of error, as if called upon, and, as it were, necessitated by fanaticism, to adopt the side of opposition; and they succeed in leading away many.

But the foundation of these sad manifestations is found in the moral region; it is evidenced in the thousandfold failures in faithfulness,—in faithfulness towards the law of the Lord, as it is treasured up in Scripture, and as it is written on the hearts. Because unrighteousness, or opposition to law, increases, therefore love in many will grow cold. For the law is absolutely the defence, the training and regulation, the horn and ornament of love.

These are the gloomy outlines of the world's history even to the world's end. It will be hard for the Church and hard for the individual to pass through all these risks. One thing, however, will aid,—patience even to the end; constancy and patience. 'He that shall endure unto the end,' says Christ, according to the two first Evangelists, 'the same shall be saved.' Luke has the stronger expression. In your patience shall ye attain your life (make it a free self-possession), after he has uttered the word,—'there shall not an hair of your head perish.' Unscathed, altogether unscathed, Christians were to pass through all the tempests of the world and its flames to the end of the world. They shall find their life once more altogether pure and glorified,

if they preserve the life of their life with ceaseless constancy and patience.

The Evangelists Mark[1] and Luke[2] insert in this place several details which Matthew perhaps more rightly has included in the instruction which Jesus imparted to the apostles.

It is not to be denied that many of these details were fulfilled in a most striking way in the earliest days of the Church.[3] The period up to the time of Constantine might be considered the first typical era of the entire Christian history of the world. But that abundance of eschatological features which is apparent in the foreground of Christian history, must not lead us to deny the universal side of these prophecies of Christ.

This is all the more manifest, when we see the agreeable features of the world's progress which Christ contrasts with those that are mournful. 'And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all people.' This is the first and the last pleasant feature in the world's history, which must and can outweigh all sorrowful features. The Gospel shall be preached in all the world, or to all the heathens (Mark xiii. 10). Then let the deceiving false Messiahs appear, one after the other; let bloody wars and wild rumour of war fill the world; let old systems be dissolved in democratic movements and revolutionary storms; let public calamities visit the whole earth; yea, let the earth itself shake into ruins,—yet the Gospel of the kingdom, of the coming kingdom of the new, and fair, and eternal polity of God, which is to issue from redemption, shall be announced to all people!

Thus decidedly shall this Gospel be published to all nations, until it has become, in respect of them, a witness which can

[1] Chap. xiii. 9–12. [2] Chap. xxi. 12–16.

[3] Stier, iii. 256–7. Among the φόβητρα, etc., mentioned by Luke, can hardly perhaps be understood such omens as Josephus has cited, according to the popular belief of the Jews. Moreover, we do not thereby understand observations of the sun and moon nor comets, as Ebrard in the above cited treatise, 33; but such phenomena as actually testify of the progress of development of earthly life in its theocratic relation. [The passage of Josephus referred to is in the *Bell. Jud.*, vi. 5, 3, which may be seen compared with passages of Tacitus, and with reference to this passage of the Gospels in Greswell, *On the Parables*, vol. v. p. 266. Greswell, whose whole dissertation is full of information, is decidedly of opinion that these were among the φόβητρα here signified.—Ed.]

testify for or against them in judgment. Then will the end come.

And this end which here the Lord refers to is certainly the world's end, for it is designated as the *end* absolutely.[1]

Then begins a new cycle—the second. This describes the destruction of Jerusalem, with its omens and with its results,—as the great judgment of God resounding through the ages over the visible polity of God, until the great world-embracing advent of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 15–28; Mark xiii. 14–23; Luke xxi. 20–24).

As soon as Christ comes to the destruction of Jerusalem, He conceives it in the prophetic importance which it has to His disciples. He assumes that they will live to see the destruction themselves. He then points out to them the sign by which they were to recognise that the judgment was about to break over Jerusalem.

He sets forth this omen as the abomination of desolation, of which the prophet Daniel[2] has spoken, that it should stand in the holy place. The Evangelist Luke explains this expression as referring to the besieging army of the Romans, which should compass Jerusalem. This army brings with it the abomination in the standards of idolatry, the Roman eagles, which pollute the holy place, the precinct of the holy city. The appearance of these signs of pollution, their establishment, the constant waving of these standards of the heathen world-power upon the holy hill, is the sign that now the desolation is determined upon the holy city. That these signs are meant, and not perhaps what occurred later, or possibly the desecration of the temple by the zealots who accomplished a massacre therein, or by the irruption of the Romans, appears from the fact that the Lord indicated this sign to the disciples as the signal for flight, and that subsequently the Christians did actually flee at the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem. If they had been told first to wait for the desolation of the temple, it would then have been much too late to take refuge in flight.

The Evangelists Matthew and Mark direct the attention of their Christian readers to this token of deliverance. They were to notice it accurately, for it was to be a sign of preservation for

[1] *Vide* the above treatise of Ebrard, 171.

[2] Chap. ix. 27. See Stier, iii. 266, on this expression.

the Christians in Jerusalem. It has even been concluded from their observation, that about the time when the calamities of war had already approached the city of Jerusalem, they must have written their Gospels.[1]

At all events, the note is not to be mistaken, 'Let him that readeth understand,'—a clear token on behalf of the true origin, the ancient historical efficiency, of the first Gospels; especially a testimony that they must have appeared before the destruction of Jerusalem.[2]

The Lord now commands His disciples that all of them who are in Judæa should take flight to the mountains, as soon as they perceive the sign mentioned. *Out of Judæa* to the mountains, signifying thereby probably not the nearest mountains, as most convenient for refuge, but the high mountains of Peræa, that mountain-chain which was probably indicated from their position in Jerusalem merely as the mountains.

But the Lord has already asserted that this flight should be very hurried, in the first word in which He referred to the destruction of Jerusalem. When ye shall see the abomination of desolation,—flee. Moreover, He expresses the same in a succession of the most urgent instructions: 'Let him that is on the house-top not go down into the house, neither enter therein to take anything out of his house; and let him that is in the field not turn back again to take up his garments' (laid aside for his work). The one was immediately to hasten away over the house-tops, the other as he stood in his under garments. Thus strongly He urges them with hyperbolical expressions, whose full and lively truth is the energy of the admonition that then they would have absolutely no time to lose. 'For these be the days of vengeance,' He adds, 'when all things which are written shall be fulfilled.'[3]

Thus the Lord enjoined His people to abandon the Jewish people in their last struggle. And, indeed, rightly so. For that last war was in the most peculiar sense a struggle for the

[1] Hug, *Introd. to the New Testament*, ii. 14.

[2] Olshausen, *in loco*.

[3] 'Scil., not only in Daniel, but in every prophecy of judgment and wrath upon the people, from the curses of Moses to the חרם with which Malachi concludes.'—Stier, iii. 270.

presumptive truth of Pharisaism, of the fanatical hatred against the heathen—a war of chiliastic madness. Only in the delusive hope of the help of a Messiah, or of a divinity such as was conceived for itself by that very fanaticism, which had crucified the true Christ, would the Jews have undertaken and persevered in this war. And therefore the Christians could take no part in the contest; for they would have thereby been partaking in the chiliastic frenzy of the Jews, which was contrary to their faith.

And thus, therefore, they faithfully followed the warning, saving instruction of the Lord in fleeing to Pella as soon as the Jewish war broke out. The preserving, delivering, pure Spirit-glance of Christ uttered the first word: it chiefly brought His own people into safety. And then He could also let the glance of His sympathy fall upon those who in such a time must suffer terribly: 'Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.' Then He adds: 'But pray ye that your flight should not be in the winter, nor on the Sabbath day.' Thus carefully He regards their flight. The addition, 'on the Sabbath day,' has been thought strange.[1] But let it be well considered what a danger there was of the Christians drawing upon themselves the sorest persecutions of the Jews, if, in that time of burning, raging fanaticism, they wished to forsake the Jewish commonwealth in Judæa on a Sabbath day. Such a regardlessness would have sufficed to make them appear in the eyes of the Jews not only as heretics, but even as traitors.

Finally, Christ considers the inevitable misery itself. Those days shall be the time of great affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the world until now.

'Neither shall be,' He adds, by way of comfort.

This affliction He goes on to delineate. According to the narrative of Luke, 'There shall be wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled.'

These words have been fulfilled, and are being fulfilled continually, with an accuracy which of itself is abundantly sufficient to glorify Christ as the Prince of the prophets.[2]

[1] De Wette, *in loc.*

[2] [They were fulfilled in the few years before and after the siege of Jerusalem, by the slaughter of about 1,500,000 Jews.—ED.]

Hereupon Christ makes one observation which is of the highest importance for the true estimation of this second eschatological cycle, as has been already intimated: 'And if those days were not shortened, no man should be saved: but for the elect's sake they shall be shortened.'

If those days were not shortened, all flesh, even humanity, would be destroyed without remedy. The meaning of that is clear enough, that, according to the stringent conception of theocratic justice, the judgment upon Jerusalem must be transmuted into the last judgment of the world,—it must result in the end of the world. And, indeed, perhaps first on this account, because it is the retribution for the crucifixion of the Son of God, their Deliverer, by the theocratic people Israel, wherein lay the decree that they have incurred the doom, and because the heathen world have decidedly partaken in this doom. But further, however, for this reason, because the people of Christ, which from that time forward was the salt of the earth, might easily have perished with them in the destruction of Jerusalem, if they had not been sufficiently early warned and delivered by their Lord. Finally, in the third place, on this account, because in the war of extermination between the Jews and the heathens, the former, who had the charge of becoming teachers and priests to the heathen, and of communicating to them the blessing of Abraham, have arrived at the point of cursing the heathen a thousandfold in the bitterest fanaticism, and because the heathens have furiously trodden under foot the theocratic people, and their sanctuary, instead of moving with the highest joy to the place of the knowledge of the living God, and entering into the spiritual fellowship of the faithful people of God. Were there no elect, like angels, to overshadow this terrible conflict, and bring to humanity the assurance of its salvation, its highest good, this conflict must proceed in one unbroken course from godless tumults of the people to the judgment of the world. But for the elect's sake, for the sake of those who are believers already, or who will one day be believers, the days of this judgment shall be shortened, the judgment is abated—is, so to speak, interrupted.

Thus arises a period of interrupted, of suspended judgment, —a period in which the doom of the theocratic people is indeed not yet concluded, but continues in suppressed judgment-days;

in which, moreover, that deep feeling of divine wrath which is the condition of the peculiar terrors of judgment, has incurred a great suspense, after which the close of the judgment is to follow.

This, then, is the period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world: the period of shortened, suppressed judgment-days.[1] The Lord is speaking of this period when He says, 'And then,[2] if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, He is there; believe him not.'

This period has a remarkable dual aspect. On the one side it is a great time of deliverance—the time of salvation of the elect; but on the other side, it shows the continuance of the judgment of the theocratic people still. First of all in the fact, that the calamitous consequences of the destruction of Jerusalem are still being worked out. Israel is scattered among the heathen. Jerusalem is trodden under foot of the heathen. In that respect that silent judgment is revealed, in which, throughout the entire interval, the people is disposed everywhere to seek a centre for the manifestation of Christ, for the glory of His kingdom, and finds it nowhere. It is the silent judgment upon the theocratic people of this period, in which the Christians sympathize with the Jews, that nowhere upon earth, in no place, in no institution nor fellowship, can they find an abode of the manifested glory of Christ the King, and yet would everywhere find it so willingly, so eagerly, so credulously. The third characteristic of this judicial position consists in the fact, that the people of God, as well as the world, must expect the Lord, who is their Redeemer, also as their Judge. That second characteristic, the want of the manifestation of Christ, becomes a terible fate, by the readiness of the Christians during this period to be led away by the chiliastic imposture of those who cry, Here is Christ! there is Christ! Christians might allow themselves, in a thousand ways, to be so captivated by dim forms of the glory of Christ, as to

[1] The word κολοβοῦν means directly to *curtail*, to *mutilate*, to *shorten*. Comp. LXX.; 2 Sam. iv. 12. But if the judgment-days are here represented as such as are curtailed or shortened, it is not thereby necessary to understand an earlier finishing of the time of judgment, but rather an abatement of the judgment, a silent continuance of it in suppressed judgment-days, in consequence of some modification.

[2] The τότε is thus referred to this intervening period of suppressed judgment. Comp. Ebrard's Treatise, 22.

become entirely estranged from the deep source and the lofty splendour of His glorious kingdom; from the spirit of His life, and from the life of His Spirit. In this period appear many chiliastic seducers: on the one side a false Christ, in pseudo-ecclesiastical form; on the other side false prophets, in pseudo-reforming tendency; and they do many wonders and signs. They represent as manifest, in powerful agencies, the irruption of new ideas and powers into the ancient forms of life, operating so marvellously, that if it were possible, even the elect would be deceived. 'Take ye heed,' adds the Lord; 'behold, I have foretold you all things:' that is, you are solemnly warned beforehand, on the one side, of the false phantoms of the Christ of the Church; on the other side, of the false prophets of new revelations.

But there was one sign by which they were to recognise that those announcements of Christ would be false. They were always to be recognised by the circumstance, that they would represent only an external, one-sided, and therefore a limited Christ, as the Lord of glory; and that therefore they should proclaim such forms of Christ, or signs of His glory, as should follow quickly, one after the other, and which would absolutely contradict one another.

At one time they would preach a Christ who is in the desert—a Christ of false world-renunciation—a glory of Christ's kingdom, which was to rest upon the egress to the wilderness, upon hermits, upon convents, and the celibate, upon a priesthood externally opposed to the world, but internally again given over to the world.[1]

Thereupon would be proclaimed, in the direction of an opposite system, a chiliastic false Christ—a Christ in the chambers,

[1] It must be distinctly remembered, that here in both cases an apparent external Christ, or kingdom of Christ, is spoken of; therefore such explanations are nothing to the purpose, as would find here, with Olshausen (iii. 259) and Stier (iii. 272), the opposition between the secret and the public kingdom. It is to be observed, that Olshausen wishes to find in the chambers the representation of the *manifest;* on the contrary, Stier that of the *secret*. But the desert (ἔρημος) sufficiently plainly recalls the hermits, and the world-historical external contradiction of the Church introduced by them. Moreover, also, the contrast plainly is suggested, whereby it is to be considered that ταμεῖον, first of all, imports the storehouses (Luke xii. 24).

in the treasure-chambers and the storehouses, in the enjoyment of earthly possessions, in the glorification of the present life, —an impersonal Christ of the chamber, in contrast to a personal Christ of the community, and a glorification of the kingdom of humanity, which was to be founded on the glory of the world.

But the one, as well as the other—as well the false Christs, with their dependents, as the false prophets, with their associates—will announce their doctrines with excessive fanatical excitement (*Ἰδοὺ*! exclaim both parties). But in the first case it is said, 'Go not forth' (into the wilderness); in the other, 'Believe it not.'

For with the second advent of Christ the case will be wholly different. The Lord indicates the form of that coming by an image, which probably He had often opposed to chiliastic expectation: 'As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be,'—thus embracing the whole world at one time—penetrating it with one beam of light, shaking it with one shock; a manifestation which will yield to no double meaning, which will leave room for no doubt—which will just as little need a herald, as the lightning needs to be illuminated with human lights—as the thunder needs to be proclaimed by human voice.

Thus will it happen as by an inevitable necessity. For where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.[1] As soon as ever the world is ripe for judgment, ripe for redemption, both parties, Christians and antichristians, unalterably divided, fall into a conflict, which is to the death—the earth on the one side becomes heaven, on the other side *hell;* so that its portions falling asunder, strive towards a new union, as is the case with a decaying carcase. Then also will the eagles make their appearance, and seek for the spoil whose scent calls them near. On the one side, heaven will appropriate its portion; on the other side, hell will appropriate its portion. Still there prevails here, in those separations, the view to the judgment—the view to a world which, in its old conditions, begins to corrupt, whilst it imagines that it has attained the highest aim with the

[1] More accurately, the vultures. Upon similar expressions in the Old Testament, which authenticate the proverbial nature of this saying, *vide* Stier, iii. 275.

grandest advances. As soon as the world is thus ripe for judgment, then comes the Judge. But the doom which He executes is a consummation of the doom upon the theocratic people. The theocratic people itself—*i.e.*, Christendom, in its external manifestation—has become a corrupting carcase. The New Testament people is now just as much decomposed by heathenish frivolity, as once the Old Testament Church was ruined by Jewish stubbornness. Hence the Lord represents the last things in the third cycle, the fundamental idea of which is the end of the world (Matt. xxiv. 29, etc.; Mark xiii. 24, etc.; Luke xxi. 25, etc.).

Here we must first of all be reminded, that in accordance with every scriptural supposition, the world's end forms the great closing epoch of the world's course. But all epochs appear in accordance with the same fundamental law. First of all, a lengthened and silent development of that principle in the life of the world, which is to be manifested in them, prepares for them through a preliminary period, and they suffer themselves to be waited for, as if they would never come. But then, when all the conditions of their appearance are fulfilled, they come so rapidly, so suddenly, as to surpass in the highest degree all human anticipations. As this is true of all epochs, so it is most especially true of the epoch of all epochs, the end of the world.

And this character of excessive suddenness is just what the Lord expresses in the impressive word 'immediately.'[1] After the tribulation of those days (of the next subsequent days of modified judgment which follow upon the destruction of Jerusalem), the sun shall lose its light, and so on, with words which we take literally in the simplest manner.

For here certainly the end of the world is spoken of. It is true that the prevailing philosophy as well as the theology of the rationalistic school is disposed to regard the doctrine of the

[1] That εὐθέως here indicates the rapidity, the suddenness, is plain, from the entire meaning and harmony of the passage; it denotes the wonderfully rapid breaking in of the great epoch. Dorner observes, on the contrary (14), that it must nevertheless be referred to μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων. But he thinks that the period after the destruction of Jerusalem cannot be understood as coming in under this θλῖψις. It has resulted, however, from our consideration, that this period must be comprehended as embracing that affliction.

end of the world, or the last day, as a 'myth of the future.' But assumptions of this kind do not affect us in the least. On the other hand, we see an unspeakable narrowing of the speculative field of view, an unspeakable straining of healthful perception, when it is no longer found necessary to take up into the consideration of the progress of man's spiritual development, the cosmical side of humanity, the progress of the earth itself; or if nothing more is sought to be known at all of a final aim, for the gradual development of humanity. And in this respect we ought, perhaps, to commend as great philosophers and theologians, those heathenish framers of myths who could not reconcile themselves to any artificially constructed scheme of the world, without a beginning and an ending, in opposition to such modern philosophers and theologians as, at least in this point, are ever stupidly easy to be contented in the necessities of their spirit. Of the beginning and end of the world, the sound man must either know or invent something; otherwise, in this 'kingdom of the mean,' it becomes too limited, too narrow for him. It is an organic spirit-voice, which bids men conceive of a black Ahriman as overshadowing the beginning and the end of the world. 'Even geology always compels us again to the same result, keeping us familiar with the idea of a future end of the world. Thus the question, after all, can only be, whether we wish the knowledge of an end of the world that is to come subordinated to the interests of humanity, or of an end of the world related to the training ground of human life as a blind, confused, destroying destiny. Philosophers and theologians of the kind intimated, find eventually the latter supposition more reasonable than the former. Christianity, on the other hand, will only know of a world's end which is subordinated to the interests of humanity, which must thus coincide with the history of the development of humanity.[1] In this sense, generally, we conceive of the relation of humanity to nature. Nature is the organic life-region of man. Thence follows, firstly, that the life of the earth must pass through a similar progress of development to that which is gone through by the life of humanity; secondly, that this progress of development must be dependent upon that of humanity; thirdly, that it must run parallel with it, and in all its substantial impulses must

[1] See the author's paper, *der Osterbote*, Part i. p. 112.

coincide with it.[1] Thus the paradisaic condition of the infant earth accords with the paradisaic condition of infant humanity. To the fall of humanity corresponds the distemperature of the earth in its physical relations. The earth trembles at the death and at the resurrection of Christ; for thereby there appeared a wondrous turning-point, as well in its life as in the life of humanity. Even through nature there prevails an impulse of development which urges forward its life towards a loftier position, just as is the case through the life of humanity.[2] In this evolution it moves forward calmly, but incessantly: thence are manifested phenomena of the advancing development of the terrene cosmos, in earthquakes, famines, and similar occurrences; just as the phenomena of progress are evidenced in the development of humanity, confirmed by Christianity. But when the end of all things shall come for humanity, because it is mature for judgment, then also the earthly sphere of humanity, its present cosmos, shall have become ripe for the catastrophe by which it is to be transformed into the new world of the new humanity.

There needs no special explanation of the way in which this view of the world accords with all sound ideas of the relation between the spirit and nature; while those hypotheses upon which nature, in relation to man, is to lie prostrate like a dead horse under the living rider,—a corpse which stiffens motionless under his feet, or finally, a corpse which may oppose the most unseasonable barrier to all his endeavours,—utterly contradict the true estimate not only of nature and of the spirit, but of their mutual relations as well.

The Christian doctrine of the end of the world may be acknowledged, indeed, without finding it again in the place here

[1] See above, vol. ii. p. 144. [2] Rom. viii. 19.

[3] Thus Dorner in the before-mentioned treatise. Dorner understands the text referred to as if it represented, in tropical imagery, the victory of Christianity over the nature-worship of heathenism (62). On other interpretations of this place, see Dorner, 61. Cocceius understands by the sun which loses its brightness, antichrist, as the false representative of the Sun in the Church; by the waning moon, the State; by the falling stars, the fall of the hierarchial lights of the Church. The great issue of these allegorical explanations is worthy of notice. The place is to be understood theocratico-historically. Upon other interpretations of this kind, which find in the text a picturesque representation of the destruction of Jerusalem, see Ebrard's *Gospel History*.

considered. But it is moreover plain, that here are specified more clearly such facts as are in general to characterize the end of the world itself, the sign of the Son of man in heaven, the advent of Christ, and the great final judgment.

But if the end of the world be spoken of here, it is in accordance with the nature of the thing that the change begins at the sun. For the earth does not stand alone in its sphere independently; its life is associated with the life of its maternal light-planet. If the earth is to be metamorphosed, the cosmical sphere must be metamorphosed with it, with which its planetary life is associated. This happens in this case, so that the change appears at first in the sun—the sun goes out, it loses its old brilliancy. Then, moreover, the moon also loses its shining; and the stars of heaven, which belong to this earthly family of planets, fall from heaven: they fall out, as Mark expresses himself; that is, perhaps, out of their old planetary association with the sun. This revolution in the cosmical sphere of the earth communicates itself then also to the earth. A distressing presentiment of the impending change invades the peoples (the new heathendom, into which at that time the great mass of humanity will be assembled); while the sea, in irregular tumult, roars and heaves. It is observed, that the powers which penetrate throughout the heavenly bodies waver; that the ancient laws of nature also—such, for instance, as the relations of gravitation—are about to be transformed. With this last change, which probably has the effect of changing the planetary-heavy relations of the earth into sidereal-light ones, to carry out the metamorphosis of the earth, will the sign of the Son of man appear in heaven, in any case perhaps a cosmical phenomenon; wherein is recognised, that henceforth the region of the Church militant coincides in one with the region of the Church triumphant—the earthly territory of the kingdom of Christ with the territory of His heavenly glory.[1] Therewith is brought about the advent of Christ. All the kindreds of the earth shall mourn, for they shall see[2] the Son of

[1] See above, vol. ii. 27, 28; also the author's pamphlet, *das Land der Herrlichkeit*, 147. Comp. Kurtz, *Astronomy and the Bible.* [A condensed abstract of this treatise is prefixed to Clark's translation of Kurtz, *On the O. T. Covenant.*]

[2] Καὶ κόψονται, etc.; καὶ ὄψονται, according to Matthew, in a signifi-

man as He comes in the clouds of heaven in power and great glory.

The Evangelist Luke has preserved for us here the admonition of the Lord to His disciples: 'When these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh!'

Now follows the judgment. The call of the heavenly spirits resounds. The elect are summoned with the loudest trumpet-blasts from their dispersion among the outcast, into the assembly of the elect. A celestial call and attraction brings them together from all the four winds, from all the corners of heaven; and therewith the separation between the good and the evil is completed.

Thus is the third cycle, the general description of the world's end complete. We see how, then, these three cycles work one into the other in very lively representation. The first embraces the representation of the entire progress of the Christian world to the end; the second sets forth God's judgment upon the theocratic community, as illustrated in the judgment upon Jerusalem; the third, God's judgment upon the nations, as it coincides with the last judgment.

The disciples had asked for a sign by which to recognise the impending destruction of Jerusalem, and similarly they desired to know by what sign they might identify the second advent of Christ. Here, however, the Lord has given them the signs by which both of these events might be known. But it is evident that there is a peculiarity common to both of these signs. They could not well be used as special notes of warning, because the judgments which they should announce were to follow their appearance with such extraordinary rapidity. This circumstance our Lord proceeds to illustrate to His disciples by a parable.

'Understand the matter from the nature of the fig-tree.' When at length the branches of this tree become tender and full of sap, and its leaves shoot forth, then ye know that the summer

cant consonance of expressions. They shall cry out in lamentation, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. The visible appearance of the Holy One to them is fulfilment of this terror, for they have lived in the supposition that the future cannot become present, the present not future—the holy not visible, the visible not holy. Hence they must needs be amazed when the great future appears brightly in the glory of judgment, in the midst of the sphere of the present.

is nigh. For the leaves of the fig-tree make their appearance late, later than the blossoms: they are late tokens; and as soon as they appear, summer is immediately after them. 'So also it is with all the rest of the trees,' according to the word of Luke.[1] And this is the case with the signs of those judgments: they do not long precede the judgments themselves, but the lightning and thunder-clap closely follow one another; because these judgments are great epochs which occur startlingly and suddenly. In this way is the word of the Lord to be understood. 'So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things as they come to pass, know that it is near, even before the doors.'

Should these signs occur within your experience, then prepare yourselves for the events which these signs announce, being close before your doors, yea, happening upon your very thresholds.[2]

He neither can nor will give them any portents of those events which may facilitate the *expectation* of them.

The disciples might now perhaps conceive that the expression of Christ, 'When ye shall see these things,' justified them in concluding that they themselves should live to behold the last day. Thereupon the Lord explains Himself now more closely as to His meaning: 'Verily I say unto you, This generation' (this race of believers planted by Me) 'shall not pass,' that is, it will continue to exist, 'till all these things be fulfilled.'[3] And

[1] This addition is surely calculated (as Dorner remarks, p. 56) to set aside the ingenious explanation of Ebrard (*Treatise*, 28, 29), according to which the point of comparison lies in the fact that the leaves of the fig-tree are poisonous, and are nevertheless forerunners of a wholesome fruit; just as the errors of the past age conceal, under the appearance of the vigour of life, their mischievous poison, but nevertheless become presages of the noblest fruit, even of the triumph of the Church of Christ. The objection to this view is strengthened by the consideration that the parable drawn by the Lord was to represent, 1st, a sign patent to observation (which the poisonous character of the fig-leaf is not); 2dly, a sign upon whose track the circumstance announced follows immediately.

[2] Hence also ἐγγύς ἐστι is closely connected with the foregoing πάντα ταῦτα, and it destroys the true meaning if anything else be supplied. This πάντα ταῦτα, moreover, refers to the 'abomination of desolation,' as a sign of the immediate destruction of Jerusalem; and to the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars, as signs of the beginning of the last day.

[3] That the word γενεά may indicate a special race—a special generation or family—is undoubted (compare Dorner, p. 30); but that it is here in-

for what reason does He know so certainly that it will continue to exist? He knows assuredly that His words are eternal, that these will continue even although heaven and earth should pass away. But His words must endure by their very nature; they must endure as words of life, living in living hearts, enlightening in enlightened hearts, reconciling and renewing in hearts that are reconciled and renewed. Thus, therefore, this His family, His race, shall assuredly endure.

For this reason He said to the disciples, 'When ye shall see all these things.' He says not these words to them in their individual character, but as representing His eternal people; and hence they could not, from His expressions, draw the conclusion that they themselves, as those individual men, should in their present state live to see that day of the commencement of the judgment. Had they been able to conclude thus, He could assuredly never have continued to address to them the words which follow—words which have it as their very purpose to prevent such consequences:—

'But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.'

It must not be forgotten that it was the Apostles and Evangelists who transmitted these words of the Lord to the Church. It is evident from this consideration, that all those assertions are false which represent the disciples as expecting the advent of Christ in their lifetime. It rather follows from this passage, that wherever they have in a lively manner expressed their expectation of the advent of Christ, they must needs have spoken in the consciousness of the Church, as of that which should not pass away, which had the promise that it should welcome the advent of Christ, and the task of constantly expecting it; thus, therefore, of *γενεά αὕτη*.

Although this effect of the expression of Jesus has been overlooked, another has been in many ways falsely apprehended, —namely, the assertion that the Son knew not the day and the

tended to designate the disciples of Jesus as an everlasting race, seems manifest from the connection, as has been here shown. Dorner's observation (S. 75) is indeed without foundation: præterea vero Christum dicere non oportebat: *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη* sed *ἡ γενεὰ ὑμῶν* seu *ὑμετέρα*. The passage is rather entirely analogous in its mode of expression to the corresponding passage, Matt. xvi. 28. There also the Lord speaks of the disciples in the third person, although he is speaking to themselves.

hour of the end of the world. It is indeed not to be denied, that the Lutheran doctrine of the '*communicatio idiomatum*—the interchange of all attributes between the divine and human nature of Christ—finds here no manner of confirmation. But, on the other hand, it is an entirely ill-founded, nay, false idea to gather from this assertion of Christ any argument for the '*positive ignorance of the Son*' in respect of that day and that hour. Rather He knows not of that chronological determination, because it is not yet suggested as a subject of reflection for Him in His living experience, in the range of His present life. He does not yet specify that point in its temporality, because to determine it would contradict His perfect childlikeness. He opposes His *not-knowing* of that moment, as a holy *not-will-to-know*, to the sinful *will-to-know* of his disciples; the divine loftiness of this not-knowing, to the human paltriness of a pretended knowledge of this kind. Thus, likewise, it is with the angels in heaven. It belongs to their eminence neither to know nor to wish to know of that externality, as perchance it belongs to the eminence of a perfect artist not to know by heart every little detail of the outward history of his art. It is thus a heavenly, an angelic, and divine ignorance, which is opposed to the pettiness and artificial importance, to the falsely, perchance sinfully, refining subtlety wherewith other men would determine and know that day.

To the Father alone it is attributed to know that day and that hour, always and eternally, because He is above the relation of time, and views all times in one eternal present; and because He knows how many millions of men have yet to be born before the tree of humanity has attained its growth; how many millions of human corruptions have still to be overcome by His truth; how many millions of human groans have still to be heard by His grace; how many ecclesiastical, political, physical, and astronomical conditions have first to be fulfilled, before the tremendous hour of the world's judgment, and the world's glorification by the coming of Christ, can strike.

If we cast a general glance upon the collective signs which Christ has declared to be portents of the judgment of God, it becomes evident that He has clearly distinguished two kinds of signs: the signs of the periodic development of the Christian world, or of the periodic course of the world; and the signs of

the new epochs which begin with the judgments of God. In respect of the periodic signs, we must again separate between such as only generally indicate the advance of the world's development—for instance, wars and persecutions of the Christians; and such whereby it may be perceived that the progress of the world's history is hastened, that the end is drawing nearer: great disturbances in the life of nations, in the ordinary course of nature, and in the Church itself on the one hand; on the other, the preaching of the Gospel throughout all the world. In respect, however, of the signs of the new epochs, the first, the abomination of desolation, has as its result the immediate destruction of Jerusalem; the last, the darkening of the sun, has as its immediate sequel the end of the world. Moreover, the first judgment itself is to be considered as a typical portent of the second.

The latter signs are thus of such a kind, they occur so closely to the judgments which they announce, that believers must not allow themselves to wait for these signs in easy security. The Lord urged this very stringently upon His disciples. This is especially the case with the signs of the last day. This will indeed be announced also by great periodic portents preceding. But these shall only indicate the beginning of the birth-pangs of the earthly world; with respect to the times, therefore, they will be very indeterminate tokens. Thus some will allow themselves ever and anon to be excited by these signs to chiliastic rashnesses and extravagance; while others will be disposed to regard them too little. Although, therefore, Christ has before warned the disciples against such excitements, He will now warn them just as urgently against this careless, comfortable view of the periodic portents of the world's history, as though such things were not of much consequence.

He finds this all the more needful, as He foresees that the world in general will not regard all the periodic signs of His advent. He sees that this degree of inconsideration of His tokens will always go on increasing to the end of the world. And hence He can set forth this very inconsiderateness, the perfectly thoughtless carnal security in which the world will be immersed, in the most utter forgetfulness of His coming to judgment, as itself a terrible portent of the approaching judgment. It might seem incredible that the world should be caught

unawares at the end, in the most stupid recklessness of the end of the world; but in the course of its theocratic history, humanity has once already illustrated this inconsistency, this recklessness (which of itself is a judgment) about its destiny—to wit, in the days of the deluge. Christ refers to that instance in the words, 'As it was in the days of Noah, so shall the coming of the Son of man be.' Hereupon He represents the picture of the world's life in the last days, in the image of those days of the flood, as a life of complete absorption in sensuality, and thus of utter forgetfulness of God, and spiritual abandonment. 'They ate and drank, they married and were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not till the flood came indeed, and swept them all away. So shall it be,' He adds once more, with emphasis, 'also at the coming of the Son of man.'

He now represents how suddenly the doom of the world shall come upon the old customary condition of the world, in a description which we have already once considered before, but which, even in respect of its significance, might perhaps be repeated.[1] Two men are working together in the field. The judgment comes upon them and separates them suddenly, whilst the one is taken, is taken by Christ, and that blessed company of heaven which attends Him, and that heavenly host carries out upon the other the opposite decree of rejection. The same separation occurs in the case of two women who are grinding at one mill.

To this picture is appended, in the liveliest manner, the exhortation to the disciples to watchfulness. Each one of the three Evangelists has preserved special features of this admonition: thus each one represents it in a special form.

According to the Evangelist Luke: 'Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged (lest your innermost life be depressed and laden) with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare it shall come on all those that dwell upon the face of the whole earth (who have so entirely devoted themselves to the interest of the great broad earth as to seek in time their only home). Watch ye therefore always, and pray that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.'

[1] See above, Book II. v. 33.

In the Evangelist Mark it is: 'Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time shall be. For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and also commanded the porter to do his work—namely, *to watch.* Watch ye therefore,' it is added; and thus the interrupted text is completed in the most significant manner, as if the Lord should say, I am the traveller; you are the porters, who are as watchful ones to receive me with welcome at my return. He adds: 'for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or at the breaking of the morning; lest, coming suddenly,' it is said in the abruptness of lively discourse, 'He find you sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!'

The Evangelist Matthew represents the Lord referring at the same time to the relation of a master of a house to the thief of the night: 'If the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and it would have been easy for him to have prevented the irruption into his house.' The counter proposition it was for the disciples to *complete;* that the ignorance of the goodman of the house of the time at which the thieves come, makes the difficulty of the watchfulness.

In this picture, the disciples appear as the masters of the house, and the Lord compares His coming to that of a thief; whereas, according to the previous representation, the disciples appear as porters, who wait for the Lord of the house coming from without. In this opposition there lies perhaps a deeper meaning: when Christians regard themselves here below in their temporal relations as door-keepers of the coming Christ, then they know that they have to expect the advent of their Lord as an extremely joyous event; but when, on the other hand, they regard themselves with earthly feelings as the lords in this house, then they begin to consider Him as an unauthorized stranger—they learn to hate Him as a thief; but they shall in that case be easily overtaken in their sleep by His unexpected irruption into their comfortable earthly abode, to their terror.[1] The Lord adds, moreover: 'Therefore be ye also ready; for ye know not what hour your Lord shall come.'

[1] See above, Book II. iii. 11.

With these last words we arrive at the parables upon the last things, which we have already considered above.

These parables are one and all appointed to describe the true 'preparation of Christian people' for the advent of Christ.

The first parable, which contrasts together the unfaithful and the faithful servant, insists upon faithfulness in the life of duty.

The second parable, which contrasts together the wise and foolish virgins, insists upon the life in the Spirit of Christ. Here the Spirit is the chief matter in the life of duty. Thus wise as well as foolish virgins are represented as slumbering. The external drowsinesses into which feeble nature might fall, do not cause a distinction in the lot of Christians at the last moment, but the distinction is founded upon the fact of their having the oil of the Holy Spirit or not.

The third parable represents, in the opposition of the faithful servants who traded with their pounds, and of the unfaithful servant who hid his pound in the earth, a life of duty which proceeds from the *spiritual blessing* of Christ, and again earns a new spiritual blessing. It shows how the calling *in the Spirit* is carried on, how the Spirit expresses itself *in the calling*.

Finally, the fourth parable represents the Lord, as He, in His return to judgment, separates men from one another, as a shepherd the sheep from the goats. Now He places the one at His right hand, because in them is matured the highest piéty of life in living unity, with the completest Christian depth and spirituality; now He places the others at his left, because they have altogether failed both in the one respect and the other. The pious thus become blessed, because they, on the one hand, in all their good works, sought Christ with the deepest devotion, and loved and found Him; while, on the other hand, they represented all their blessed peace in Christ, with the deepest practical truth in works of mercy. That is the perfect Christian life: hence also the perfect watchfulness—the readiness to receive the Lord at His coming as the accomplisher of redemption.

But with the deepest earnestness, Christ in these parables emphasizes the doom of rejection, which infallibly for eternity awaits the unfaithful labourers in His service; which awaits those who do not live in His Spirit,—those, moreover, who do

not realize in life the spiritual blessing which they receive from Him,—those, finally, who are neither fundamentally rooted in Christ, nor are fittingly authenticated by works of charity towards their neighbours.

Thus, through all these parables, there echoes the word with which Mark has closed the sayings of Jesus about the last things: 'What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!' This is the practical and substantial thought of all the discourses of the Lord on the last things—that His people must watch! They are always to be in condition to welcome the last day with its terror, to be able to appear with good courage before the presence of the Son of man in His judgment. For that purpose a constant wakefulness is needed before all things,—a continual arousing of their faculties out of the illusion of spiritual sloth, which conceives that existing Christian attainments are good enough,—out of the illusion of ease, which thinks that present circumstances are permanent, into the aspiration and the holy fear with which the advent of Christ reasonably fills Christians. Further, there is needed a continually renewing refreshment of eye and heart by means of this expectation; a continually renewed revival in the heart of the death of Christ, of His cross, of the judgment, of His Spirit; and an exclusion from the heart of everything which might establish in it a new spiritual sloth, lust, and fear, and contradict the life in the death of Christ. Finally, there is needed a more continual apprehension of the world, and of life, in that definite manner which is in accordance with the nature of Christ's advent,—the recognition, for instance, of the living unity and reciprocal action between His historical and spiritual advent; the being penetrated with the feeling of this unity, and the discovery therein of the explanation of the apparent contradiction between the *manner* and *certainty* of the coming of Christ, and the *uncertainty* and probable *remoteness still* of that advent.

The coming of Christ would not be historically what it should be, were it not at the same time spiritual; it would not be spiritually what it is, were it not likewise historical.

It belongs to the conception of the historical coming of Christ, that it cannot occur until the Church is matured to the recognition, in His appearance, of a fuller and more abundant salvation and life; until the faithless world is matured to behold

in it a more public judgment; until thus the whole of humanity can behold in it a more manifest spirit, so that its effect shall not be of a sensible and chiliastic character, but a complete operation of the Spirit of Christ in the manifestation of Christ.

On the other hand, we may not speak rightly of a spiritual future of Christ, except we acknowledge in this future a security that He will one day appear in person. Certainly it is possible mistakenly to indicate the extension of Christian views and principles in a spiritual sense, as a spiritual coming of Christ; which must not only render its historical significance superfluous, but must even deny it. But in such a case, the spiritual advent of Christ is not spoken of according to the full value of the Christian conception: it is not of an illumination, in which Christ personally appears as the everlasting Son of humanity; not of a reconciliation, in which He atones as the everlasting High Priest of His race; not of a sanctification, in which He personally reigns as the Eternal King, who establishes a kingdom and makes it manifest. But the Spirit of the true advent of Christ is a Spirit which may be regarded as the vital breath of His approach, which testifies of His personal life, and establishes the personal life of those who receive Him in union with Him, and evermore transforms and so prepares them to become one day transplanted into the sphere of Christ's manifestation.

And thus, generally, the spiritual advent of Christ is related to His historical advent, as the period is related to the epoch. A new epoch comes, indeed, always with every impulse of the period which precedes it, especially with every movement which this period makes. Thus, also, the coming of Christ is announced in all the experiences of His people, of His believers, but especially in all the judgments of God upon corrupt forms of the theocratic people, in all reformations and purifications of His Church.

The apostles were penetrated with this consciousness. They knew that in the ground of the world's history, in the ground of their heart and of the heart of humanity, the Christian era had already begun; therefore they had the presentiment of the last days, which belongs to the outer course of the world.[1] They had the consciousness that Christ had overcome sin and death, and therewith the entire old form of this world; that He had

[1] See the passages on the subject in Ebrard's Treatise, referred to.

made use of the old world as the principle of a new life in the centre of humanity, and was penetrating, in order to transform it; that He also had thus taken possession of them, and that for that very purpose He was also constantly drawing near to them in His manifestation; and in this deep apprehension of Christ they said, 'He comes quickly.' Through Him they had a participation in the Spirit of God, in whose sight a thousand years are as one day; and in that great sense of God, by that keen perception of the eyes of the seer, which could sweep abroad over the field of time as with eagle's vision, they said, He comes quickly. They were pervaded with the consciousness of the Church, in a degree of which we have no knowledge; and they knew with certainty that the Church would greet the Lord at His coming, as a bride the bridegroom. Therefore they said, in their large sympathy with the Church, He will come to *us*, *we* shall behold Him. Moreover, this consciousness was not weakened by their individual Christian experience of life, for they knew that at their death the Lord would come to them; that they should then appear before His throne; therefore they spoke with the most universal living truth of the nearness of the advent of Christ.

And yet they not only determined nothing about the time and about the hour, but they distinctly opposed all chiliastic and precipitate announcements of Christ's advent, and pointed to conditions which made it improbable that in an outward historical sense the Lord could be manifested thus soon.[1]

They thus comprehended both the Christologic certainty and nearness of the coming of Christ, and the cosmical chronological uncertainty and conjectural remoteness of it, in one,—a great, calm, sacred, spiritual stimulus, which was at one with the deepest peace of the soul; and from this consciousness arose their peculiar expressions upon the nearness of the Lord.

We may consider these utterances as the expression of their deep, faithful watchfulness.

Thus these utterances must needs appear to the critic as words of fanatical self-delusion, in proportion as he has lost the perception of that great sense of God and God's measure of time which prevailed in the apostolic Church; of the energy of that conviction of Christ, of their sense of fellowship and confidence in their

[1] See 2 Thess., and 2 Peter.

divinely happy personality and immortality. But in proportion as one seeks to live up to the eschatologic relations of our real life, of our world's history in its relation to Christ, in that proportion will the understanding of the words of Christ and of His apostles be brought about; and it will be ascertained that the Evangelist Mark has rightly comprehended the whole doctrine of the last things, according to their practical application in the one word—Watch!

NOTES.

1. Already in those early days spiritualism had been recognised in the Christian Church as the natural antipodes to Chiliasm, and had restrained without being able to get rid of it. It could not do the latter, because it was itself just as one-sided as the other, and therefore needed just as often to be corrected by it, as on its own side it imposed a curb on its antagonist. Chiliasm cannot wait for the regeneration of the new world by the Spirit, and thus represents that new world in something of a 'Fata morgana.' Spiritualism, on the other hand, has not the sound Christian heart to be able to expect the evolution of a new world out of the new birth which the Spirit of Christ brings about. The former imagines that Christ is to found a sensible spiritual kingdom—the latter that He is to establish a purely spiritual kingdom. Thus the former forgets that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God—that everything that appears glorified in the new world must proceed from the Spirit of Christ, and must be a spiritual form pure as crystal. The latter loses sight of the fact that the Spirit of Christ is everywhere, according to the nature of Christ and of Christianity,—spirit and life: that it renews the life, and accomplishes the resurrection of the body.

2. Strauss (ii. 324) endeavours to make out that Jesus Himself had, in an erroneous manner, fostered the notion that soon after the fall of the Jewish sanctuary, according to Jewish notions the centre of the present world, this world itself would come to an end, and the Messiah would appear for judgment. This and similar suppositions were successfully combated in the above-mentioned treatise of Ebrard, '*Adversus erroneam nonnullorum opinionem*,' etc., to which we refer the reader. Strauss endeavours to establish the above assertion, by

showing that the εὐθέως (Matt. xxiv. 29), in its relation with what precedes, does not allow a 'vast period' to be interpolated between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, according to the representation of the Evangelist, but especially by protesting that the word ἡ γενεά, v. 34, must always signify the generation; and that thus it is determined that the Evangelist represents the Lord as saying that the generation of His own contemporaries should live to see the end of the world. The last assertion finds its perfect solution in what Dorner has said in the treatise already cited (*de oratione Christi eschatologicâ*, p. 76) upon the meaning of the word γενεά. As to the former argument, Strauss himself has manifested no strong disposition to rely upon it. It has been shown above, that the text certainly recognises a period of time between the destruction of Jerusalem and the εὐθέως. Moreover, if the τότε, v. 23, be referred to a length of time after the destruction of Jerusalem, the true importance of the words κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι must at once be rendered even more prominent than has hitherto been the case. Fritzsche, in his *Commentary on Matthew* (710), has shown that the shortening of the days referred to may be understood not merely of the shortening of the time, but also of the contraction of the individual days themselves. 'Certe Rabbinici magistri diei,' he says, 'quo mortuus esset Abasus rex, detractas esse decem horas tradunt (cf. Lightfoot, ad h. l.) ne quis homini pessimo lessum posset facere.' But what can such a shortening of the individual days of judgment signify here, other than the continuance of the judgment in a suppressed and broken form, distinct from that which at first appeared? Consequently the Lord distinguishes the days of uninterrupted judgment, or the days of the great tribulation; and the shortened days of judgment, in which the chastisement of the theocratic church continues in a subdued form, and especially in the fact that as well the heathens as the Jews must do without a centre of the kingdom of God upon earth, or that Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot of the heathens, whilst the Gentile Christians everywhere are aroused and endangered by false symptoms of the coming Messiah, till their time also is fulfilled, till also the judgment on the heathen world in its antichristianity is matured. Dorner (p. 73) has observed with keen censure, that Strauss, 'nimis avide duplici virgâ Evangelium cædere ten-

tans,' involves himself in a contradiction; assuming at one time that the two first gospels were written long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and then again that the Evangelists had reported with solicitude the words of Christ even then, according to whose tenor the end of the world was to follow soon upon the destruction of Jerusalem, although these predictions must by that time have already been proved erroneous. Thus, according to p. 345, the texts in Daniel ix. 27, and others, are to be referred exclusively to the desecration of the holy place under Antiochus Epiphanes. According to p. 348, however, they ought to be described in the texts Dan. vii.–xii., as calamities in other places, which announce and accompany the day of the coming of Jehovah, or were to precede the advent of the Messianic kingdom of the Holy One. Thus it is said, p. 339: 'To consider the judgment of the world, the coming of Christ, as anything successive, is the directest contradiction of the mode of representation in the New Testament.' On the other hand, it is said, p. 352, upon the words of John iii. 18, ἤδη κέκριται: 'This only asserts thus much, that the assignment to every one of his merited destiny is not reserved till the future judgment at the end of things; but every one bears in himself, in his internal condition even now, the fate meet for him: therefore an impending solemn award of judgment is not excluded.' The rest partakes of similar characteristics.

3. According to Stier, the sayings of the Lord concerning the last things ought to be distributed into three sections, which represent an orderly chronological sequence of eschatologic events.[1] First of all, p. 249, he says that the Lord treats of the destruction of Jerusalem, chap. xxiv. 1–28; secondly, of His other proper (mediatorial) coming to the public opening of His kingdom for His then assembled elect, chap. xxiv. 1–25, 30; thirdly, of the great day of judgment of the King, 'in full power and glory over all the people at the end of the world,' or of the last coming of Christ at the last day, Matt.

[1] [It is due, however, to Stier to say that he counts this a misunderstanding of his view, and does 'not intend a strictly defining and adjusting chronology of the future, but only a progression in the stages here placed in juxtaposition, in which, at the same time, the whole is always reflected in each.' That is to say, he maintains the perspective view of prophecy, and holds that this is not inconsistent with the dignity of our Lord's person. —Ed.]

xxv. 31–46. In a similar manner Olshausen characterizes the sections (see the *Commentary*, 908–918). Opposed to this, however, is the fact, *first*, that the consideration in Matt. xxiv. 14 goes at once to the end of the world; *secondly*, that, according to chap. xxiv. 22, a period of time is specified after the destruction of Jerusalem; *thirdly*, that in ver. 29 the most definite features of character are declared of the end of the world, and that here already all peoples definitely express the presentiment that the judgment is now at hand; *fourthly*, that in ver. 33 the description is apparently closed with a retrospect and an application, to which belong the parables which follow, although they certainly serve more fully to unfold the doctrine of the last judgment; especially also to show that, after all the warnings of Christ, many men will still incur the judgment. It is indeed not to be denied, that the parable of the wise and foolish virgins has features which, in relation to those of the last parable of judgment, seem to point to the continuance of the judgment of Christ even to the last day. Apart from what has been observed, there are great difficulties in conceiving of the return of Christ to the establishment of the first resurrection (the kingdom of a thousand years), as an external visible thing,—not to refer to the Augsburg Confession. Especially there is found in Scripture no intimation of a second departure of Christ for a second ascension.

4. With this section must be compared the description of the destruction of Jerusalem in Josephus, in the history of the Jewish war; the Apocalypse also, and the result of the later Geology.

SECTION VIII.

THE WITHDRAWAL OF JESUS INTO RETIREMENT AGAIN. RETROSPECT OF THE EVANGELIST JOHN UPON THE MINISTRY OF THE LORD.

(Luke xxi. 37, 38; John xii. 37–50.)

For two successive days, Christ had sojourned from morning to evening in the temple, and taught. The people had already

become accustomed to look for Him daily in the temple again. And thus the crowds set out on the Wednesday once more to seek Him in the temple, and to hear Him. But on this occasion they sought Him and waited for Him in vain; Jesus came no more to the temple.

The Evangelist John expressly declares that Jesus had at this time gone forth from the temple; that He had withdrawn Himself from the people, and gone back into retirement. The reason was, as we have seen, that the leaders of the people had mistaken, tempted, and rejected Him in the temple. In that rejection, He was banished from the national interest as it now subsisted. His prophetic mission to Israel was fulfilled. That the people in the mass were always glad to hear Him, was no longer the consideration; for it was necessary for Him to conceive of the people as it stood to Him legally, and as it was represented to Him by its magistrates. Moreover, it had become quite evident to Him, that at the decisive moment the people would hold and act together with its rulers, according to its external and legal character, in confirming the rejection of His person.

He had now also been separated from the people as Prophet, since He had announced to them the judgment. Had He no longer been linked to the people by another tie than that of His prophetic character, He would probably have returned no more to the city. Hence, therefore, arose a solemn pause, in which Christ had withdrawn Himself from the people. For them it had now become a question whether they should look upon Him again.

The Evangelist John avails Himself of this pause to cast a retrospective glance upon the entire ministry of Christ in Israel up to its mournful issue, and upon the causes of that issue.

Although He had done such wonders before their eyes, laments the faithful disciple, yet they did not believe in Him. He points, on the one side, to the entire development of Christ's life, with the most various manifestations of His glory. On the other side, He indicates the decided unbelief which was generally displayed among the people when Christ discovered to them His glory.

But the profound spirit of the disciple is comforted, in respect of the awful misconduct and disaster of His people—in God. He looks upwards from the guilt of men to the purpose

of God, as He adds, 'That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?' (Isa. liii. 1). The prophet Isaiah had already experienced that only a few acknowledged the Word and the Spirit of God in the preaching of the prophets, and surrendered themselves faithfully to the living call of God therein, and that only a few were willing to understand and lay to heart the arm of the Lord—His judgment in the visitations which the prophets announced and interpreted; so few, indeed, that it might almost seem as if there were none at all. It was actually this perception which gave him the feeling of the sufferings of the prophetic character, in which the Spirit of the Lord formed the vision of the *great* suffering Prophet—the sorrowing Messiah. But the disciple knew that in this complaint the prophet had expressed a theocratic fact of all times, which must needs be fulfilled in the largest measure in the life of Christ; yea, a fact which must directly lead to the suffering of Christ. He proves Himself to be a master in the interpretation of Scripture, by quoting in this reference the saying wherewith Isaiah announces the suffering Messiah. He has already, in the second place, intimated wherefore the Jews did not believe,—to wit, because the arm of the Lord was not revealed to them. If man is to believe on God's word, his soul must first be shaken and possessed by God's deed. The power of God, in the energy that accompanies His word, must make itself known to him from heaven.

Thus therefore,[1] explains the disciple, they could not believe. The arm of the Lord had not been revealed to them. He explains this fact now in its complete and heavenly importance, as he continues: 'For again Esaias said, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.'[2] Here, however, it might have readily been objected to the Evangelist, as our critics of to-day observe,

[1] The διὰ τοῦτο is perhaps not to be referred to the following ὅτι, but to what precedes. Moreover, not to the ἵνα, but to the τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη. The second place specifies the ground of the first, and the second citation from Isaiah is intended to explain this place.

[2] Isa. vi. 10, freely quoted, and strictly agreeing neither with the Hebrew nor with the Septuagint. In respect of the difference between the Hebrew and the LXX., compare Lücke, *in loco*.

that the prophet had indeed spoken of a hardening of his people in his times, but that he could not also have spoken it of the time of Christ. The Evangelist does not question the reference to that historical circumstance, but he does not therefore forego in the least the consequence that might be deduced from it. In this sense he observes, 'These things said Esaias, because he saw His glory, and spake of Him.'

At his call to the prophetic office, Isaiah had a wondrous vision. He saw the glory of the Lord. It was the glory of the Self-revealing! of Him who lowered Himself with His throne to the temple of God, surrounded with the symbols of His revelation,—thus a vision of God as He represented Himself to the seer, conceived in the way of His incarnation; and therefore a vision of Christ. Isaiah thus beheld the glory of Christ in the spirit; he beheld the King. In the light of this glory, moreover, and in contrast with it, was revealed to him the sinfulness of his own nature,[1] his inability to convert the people, and thus also the deep immorality of his people, and the assurance that they would only still more harden themselves against his preaching.

Since, then, Isaiah obtained this glimpse into the hardening of his people, by seeing them in the light of Christ's glory—in the light of the thrice holy One,—it is plain that he expressed his judgment upon the people—in substance, upon the Jewish people—as it would continue to harden itself against the word of God, till the time of Christ, rather than upon the people of his time alone. Thus, as on one side, in the spirit of vision, he saw Christ in His glory, so, on the other side, he saw the people as they appeared in this light, and blinding themselves against it. His words are thus always capable of being referred, first of all, to his own contemporaries; but they are (in accordance with their prophetic nature) words which, in the highest sense, have the life of Christ in view, and have been fulfilled in Him.

Thus Isaiah had already experienced, that his people were not only blinded and hardened against his prophesying, but that it was actually the effect of this prophesying to complete that blinding and hardening. And nevertheless, he knew that he had been commissioned by the omniscient God. And thus it was also certain in his mind, that it was God's counsel and decree that this blindness should come upon this people; and

[1] Isa. vi. 5.

at the same time it was manifest to him also, that this decree was a judgment.

First of all, it is the guilt of man which results in this incapacity to recognise the divine. But then it is a divine decree, that this incapacity must increase, even to the blindest rejection and denial of salvation. Then it is an acknowledged general historical law of God, that sin at once and always results in blindness, helplessness, and servile fear—that it must thus beget the principles of threefold deeper sinfulness. Moreover, it is further a special law of God in history, that salvation is presented to the hardened sinner, and that thereby the process of his destructive career is hastened.

This rolling wheel of advancing induration can only be brought to a stand-still in an abyss of guilt and misery: this wheel, in which judgment is ever anew entangled with sin, and sin ever anew entangled with judgment—in which all salvation is changed into doom; so that at length, even out of judgment, salvation may proceed.

The judgment of God, which the prophet Isaiah recognised, in the hardening of his people, illustrates to him the dark decree of God in this hardening, and makes it appear to him as a pure revelation of righteousness. In this righteousness appeared to him thus the terrible flame of God, which, as light, illuminated God's dark decrees upon Israel, and, as fire, consumed the dark guilt of the people.

As this consolation was fitted for the day of Isaiah, so, according to the meaning of his word, it is still more fitted for the day of Christ. And as the eagle spirit of an Isaiah could find a melancholy consolation for the hardening of his people, in this holy and heavenly depth of the righteous counsel of God; so still more, in the light of the new covenant, can John, kindred as he is in spirit to Isaiah, the eagle of the evangelic history.

The Evangelist expressed a general judgment upon the people, as represented by its rulers. This sentence might now be misunderstood, in the feeling that generally the rulers in Israel had received no impression at all, no warning of the glory of Christ. But to such a misunderstanding he opposes himself, with an observation which is to define his sentence more closely: 'Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on Him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him,

lest they should be put out of the synagogue (excommunicated): for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.' This is scarcely said of Nicodemus and of Joseph of Arimathea; although their lengthened restraint by the power of that motive testifies what a number of men, less noble and less endowed with grace among their fellows in dignity, fell thereby into a ruinous snare. John had looked more deeply into the dispositions which actuated the circle of the Sanhedrim than the other disciples. He had been known in the family of the high priest. He knew what a favourable impression the personality and ministry of Christ had made in the circle of the leaders of the Jewish people. But he knew also how strongly the Pharisaic institution ruled in them, and how much the judgment of orthodoxy and heresy, of honour and shame, was decided in accordance with its dull and slavish spirit. That spirit had long ago established the law, that whoever should acknowledge Christ, should be liable to excommunication; and the minds of the Jews, even the most eminent of them, were more afraid of the disgrace attached to excommunication, than of its civil disabilities. Thus, even many of those rulers who had received an impression of the glory of Christ, tremblingly held back from a surrender of themselves to His communion, because this would have drawn upon them their excommunication on the part of the Pharisaic interest. They shuddered thus at the ignominy of apparent heterodoxy to which they must have been subjected, if they had been willing to live for the true spiritually living orthodoxy, for the faith in Christ: they chose the honour (the δόξα) of men, thus also the orthodoxy of men; and therefore gave up the honour which is with God, in surrendering the truth, which even, according to their knowledge, was orthodoxy before God. Thus also, it was the fear of the Pharisaic institutions which completed the judgment in Israel, and brought the Lord to the cross.

It is the peculiar nature of Pharisaism, as it continues immortally to appear in a hundred forms throughout history, that in the alliance of spiritual indolence with the life of the people, it stamps as scholastic decrees the impure notions of the people, which are always deposited upon the pure doctrines of revelation and the doctrinal determinations of the Church, and gradually forms them into institutions and traditions which it vindicates as the highest expressions of orthodoxy; while precisely those

notions which are generally established in the mind of every people, whether Gentile or Jew, are therefore charged with superstition and with utter heresy. These institutions, moreover, it strives to establish as an inviolable law for all spirits; and for that purpose it draws into its interest the same slavish popular spirit which has produced them; summons it to the highest chair of judgment to decide upon doctrines, in order with its help to condemn all purer apprehensions and representations of revelation which oppose its institutions. But the fearful authority which it wields in this direction terrifies most spirits into a totally slavish attitude; and even many who have the beginnings of a better knowledge, allow themselves to be startled by its ban to such a degree, that they forego the truth, and the honour which is with God, in order to vindicate the honour which is among men, in feigned surrender to these institutions.

But those ambitious ones were all the less capable of becoming associates of Christ, that He, in His whole Spirit and ministry, set forth the direct contrast to their ambition—that He, in perfect sincerity, sought not the honour that is from men, but the honour that is from God; yea, the honour of God. Thus John now represents Him, in opposition to His ambitious despisers. Jesus cried, and said, 'He that believeth on Me, believeth not on Me, but on Him that sent Me. And he that seeth Me, seeth Him that sent Me.' This He declared often and solemnly; this He again and again affirmed. Thus faith in Him, He declared, must necessarily lead to the purest faith in God; and if any one looks on Him, and fully acknowledges Him in the Spirit, he shall know that He with perfect transparency and likeness reveals the Father: it must happen to him that contemplates Him, that the human nature in its temporal form will pass away from his sight, and he shall behold through Him only the Father in heaven. Thus, moreover, there is no difference between faith in Him, and the simplest faith in God, or rather faith in Him is the medium of pure faith in God; and thus also His manifestation, His honour, forms not the slightest shadow which might darken the honour of God; rather is it His honour to reveal the honour of God. Thus He was opposed in perfect nature and glory to those who polluted faith in God by faith in their institutions; who disturbed and depraved it; who made with their honour and their

respectability among men, a dark cloud which could not but obscure the pure bright form of the honour of God.

The Evangelist prosecutes this fundamental thought of the manifestation of Christ, that it led everything back to the Father still more closely, by connecting therewith His words in significant expression, according to His own lively remembrance of them.

'I am come a light into the world,' said He, 'that whosoever believeth on Me should not abide in darkness.' Even as the visible light of heaven does not make itself visible, but enlightens that which is visible; so Christ, as the pure divine light of heaven, glorifies the Father and enlightens the world, in order to lead back mankind out of the darkness of unspeakable spiritual entanglement of self and the world, to the pure recognition of God and all things in Him.

Thus would He become to the faithful the fuller light of the world, not a world shadow, as every selfish personality forms it. Nay, He explains further. Even the unbelieving, who hear His word and will not receive it, He will not judge of Himself, and in His historical manifestation. He will erect no special worldly court against them; for he is not come to judge the world, but to save the world. Rather shall that man that rejected Him be judged by His word which he has heard from Him, and has not received. This word shall judge him at the last day. Thus, in His judicial ministry, He will do nothing beyond the efficiency which resides in His word in the eternal truth, as He has announced it. The word of Christ alone—which the unbeliever has once heard, and has regarded as an empty sound, as a voice gone forth and soon forgotten—shall, in the imperishable heavenly power of its truth, pursue him, whisper, echo, and resound after him, until in the last day it breaks over him in the thunder of a doom of condemnation, bearing just the same testimony, as the sentence of the truth coming into manifestation, which separates the believing and the unbelieving.

Moreover, Christ declares this imperishable and judicial power of His word, just for the reason that His word is just as free from individual arbitrariness, and from the false legal character, as His appearance and His entire nature. 'For I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should

speak.' With this declaration we receive a considerable disclosure of the purity and subtlety, of the infinite certainty, of the divine consciousness in Jesus. It was thus engaged in every word that He spoke, as a clear internal law of life received from the Father. He spoke every word according to its meaning, and according to its expression, with the consciousness that so it had been committed to Him of the Father. He knew, in expressing Himself thus upon this unutterably subtle mystery of His inmost life, that He had thus hitherto spoken every word by the commission of the Father; and that, for the time to come, He would continue to speak every word in similar purity, by the Spirit and law of the Father. This is the most perfect union, and the most perfect freedom—an infinitely pure and appointed life of the Son in the Father. In this divine faithfulness, moreover, He has the consciousness that this divine law of life is the assurance of His life-giving nature. 'I know,' says He, 'that His commandment is everlasting life.' In this everlasting life, which is one with the eternal certainties of the life of God, He is involved; from it, He speaks every word of His, diffusing eternal life. When, then, this eternal life in His word comes to judgment upon a man, it comes to this judgment on His behalf, although, by its light, it reveals eternal death, which he has himself chosen for himself.

The Evangelist closes all these sayings of Christ comprehensively with the words: 'Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak.'

Thus John conceived and recognised the Lord; thus he understood His assertions about His own nature. In His whole nature he found no trace of arbitrariness, egotism, worldly pretension, or dogmatism, but the pure image of God—the evident pure light of God glorifying God and the world in its simplicity. And thus he found in His word no falsely positive particle, and no false sound, but the simple call of God—the perfect echo of the pure creation—the pure word of everlasting truth—the everlasting life of all God's law—the divine law of all everlasting life—everlasting life itself; thus, therefore, the word of enlightenment and enfranchisement for every human heart which seeks its honour in the honour of God, and not its glorification in the false glorification of men. But because he

thus recognised the Lord, and understood His word in the pure ideality of a great mission of God, of the perfect revelation of the Father, therefore he also comprehended every expression of Christ concerning His vocation, and His relation to the world, according to its innermost significance, and was able to give to it this concentrated expression.

Moreover, he can thus console himself with this remembrance during a pause wherein Jesus, despised and rejected by His enemies, left the temple and went back into retirement. He knows that Jesus can go back pure to His Father, since He has purely fulfilled the mission of the Father, and that of His entire ministry nothing is lost, because it is wholly discharged in God. He knows also that the despisers of Jesus have not to do with the personality of Jesus as it appeared in the form of a servant, passing through the world and time; but with the eternal word of God which He has spoken, with the great eternal reality, yea, with God Himself, whose judgments surround and enclose all their guilt, just as formerly the fire of God blazed around and through the burning bush. But the most consolatory fact which supports him in this mournful consideration, is the certainty that Christ has redeemed and led back himself and his kindred out of darkness to a walk in light.

He saw a judgment in the separation of Christ from the temple institution of His people; but he acknowledged this judgment, in its pure spirituality, altogether as a judgment of God. Therefore the entire work, the entire mission of Christ, stands to him in the purest ideality or sanctity; and it is just this view that he set forth in his retrospect of the prophetic ministry of Christ.

NOTES.

1. Among the interpreters of John in later days, the view has more and more prevailed, that John is recapitulating the previous ministry of Christ in the section here considered. The last objections of Strauss and De Wette to this view have been set aside by Schweizer (p. 12) and Tholuck. Compare the latter on the passage (p. 301). As to the Aorist forms which occur in this section, Tholuck observes: 'There is not the smallest objection to taking the Aorist as the pluperfect, especially in recapitulating; yet the Aorists may be considered, without hesitation, as

narrative. It is, indeed, confessed that the Greeks, according to Kühner (ii. p. 76), use the Aorist when they speak of an appearance often perceived in the past.' The fact here is, perhaps, that John represents briefly, as a historian, the ministry of Christ in its outlines; and, indeed, as pure ideality, in opposition to the false positive institutions of the Jews who put Him to death.

2. In the above citation and confirmation of the difficult passages in John, there has been often sought a confirmation of the harsher doctrine of predestination,—often, indeed, under the false supposition that John intended to represent the hardening of the Jews as having been caused by Isaiah's prophecy. Lücke remarks (ii. p. 536): 'Strict monotheistic Hebraism, which makes no distinction between the mediate and the immediate,—the divine causation and permission,—absolute decrees and God's ordinance as related to human freedom,—refers evil and wickedness also to the divine causality. But Scripture contains everything to exclude the misunderstanding that God is the effective origin of evil.' It may be asked here, first of all, in this respect, which is right; whether the Old and New Testament view of the relation referred to, or the modern estimate of it, which would place *permission* in the place of *causation?* But before all things, the meaning of the passages of Scripture referred to should itself be accurately settled. Scripture scarcely refers *evil immediately, and as such,* to the divine causality. Between suffering and evil there is an indissoluble relation: evil in itself is the perverted nothingness which the will consummates in sinful self-determination. Suffering, however, is the manifest working out of evil in substantial life; and thus is itself substantial. But for that very reason it is, moreover, no pure, simple, true working out of evil. It is not only its result, but rather the reaction against it. Suffering, as the substantial phenomenon of evil, is not only God's permission, but also God's ordinance, because it comes into the sphere of the substantial as a reaction against evil in its pure spiritual form. But none the less, we have no hesitation in characterizing evil, although modified a thousandfold when apparent, and therefore also existing in the substantiality of suffering, unconditionally as evil,—for instance, a murder, a war, and the like; and we are justified in so doing, so far as we regard in these manifestations of evil, the evil acts of will which produced them. But just as, in this case,

we have no hesitation in losing sight of the suffering as caused by God in human sin, so the Holy Scripture has just as little hesitation in losing sight of the sin in the suffering—and, indeed, with equal justice. But inasmuch as it characterizes such sufferings as are from God constantly as judgments, it refers definitely enough to sin as not being from God. From the depth and energy of its divine consciousness results its expression in the manner referred to: it knows that God rules throughout the whole region of the substantial, not merely as permitting, but as effecting; whereas this is denied if suffering is always ready to be called evil. But the manifest sin which is neutralized by its result, is never regarded under the aspect of suffering as judgment upon the vanity of the heart which originated the sin. But how often must the sense of God's rule in the world suffer, if, in all the events in the world's history which have resulted from evil, the control of God is only acknowledged as permissive, not as effective.[1]

[1] [Augustin's remarks on the passage are a fine sample of his exposition (*Tract. in Joan.* 53, 4). In reply to the objection mentioned above, he says, 'Quibus respondemus, Dominum præscium futurorum per Prophetam prædixisse infidelitatem Judæorum; prædixisse tamen, non fecisse. Non enim propterea quemquam Deus ad peccandum cogit, quia futura hominum peccata jam novit. Ipsorum enim præscivit peccata, non sua.'—Ed.]

PART VII.

THE TREASON OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AGAINST THE MESSIAH. THE DECISION OF THE SANHEDRIM. THE PASCHAL LAMB AND THE LORD'S SUPPER. THE PARTING WORDS. THE PASSION, DEATH, AND BURIAL OF JESUS. THE RECONCILING OF THE WORLD.

SECTION I.

THE LAST ANNOUNCEMENT OF JESUS THAT HIS DEATH WAS AT HAND. THE DECISION OF THE SANHEDRIM. THE APPOINTMENT AND THE PREPARATION OF THE PASSOVER FEAST.

(Matt. xxvi. 1–5, 17–19; Mark xiv. 1, 2, 12–16; Luke xxii. 1, 2, 7–13.)

We have seen how Jesus, in His character of prophet, departed from the temple of His people, when the authorities of the people, like dark demons of unbelief, opposed themselves to Him there. But in so doing He did not separate Himself from the people. With them He was still linked as an Israelite, although as a prophet He had been rejected by their leaders; and even although the temple had become for Him a desolate house and forsaken of God, the law of the Easter celebration had still the old meaning for Him. For this festival was older than the temple worship: it was linked with the innermost life of the nation; it was founded upon the original theocratic assumption, that every father of a family is a priest in his own house, and that he has to discharge therein the priestly office of atonement. Thus Christ was still bound to the celebration of

the paschal feast, because He was still bound to His people, especially to His disciples; and because He still had the task of representing the priestly office, in the character of distributor of the paschal feast in their midst. It might also be said that the Easter festival, in its typical character, still had validity for Him; because the real Easter celebration, the offering up of His life, had not yet occurred. But it must moreover be noticed, that besides the spiritual and eternal motive of His sacrifice, He must have a legal motive to go again to Jerusalem, in order there to surrender His life for the salvation of the world. If this legal motive had been wanting to Him, it might be possible to regard His death as a wilfully incurred suffering,—a view which many possibly have taken. But this would contradict the idea of His sacrifice. His death could only be an act of pure surrender of self, in the case of its being brought about just as much by the law of God as by His own eternal decree, or just as much historically as ideally; by the harmony of the freest self-determination of Christ, with the necessity, with the inexorable claim of a definite historical sense of duty in His decision. And thus in fact it was: Christ knew that only His death on the cross in Jerusalem could and must save the world, and for this death He was in spirit prepared. But He knew, moreover, apart from the certainty of His death, that as a true Israelite and spiritual Father of His family, He must return to Jerusalem. This historical duty called Him back to the city for the feast.

Moreover, He was not for one moment in doubt on the subject. The Jews might have asked, Will He ever come again? when they saw Him depart from the temple mountain in so severe a mood. But in his heart it was no question whether He should soon return. And He did not leave His disciples long in doubt on the matter.

It was still on the same evening on which, with His disciples, He had departed from the temple, and had announced to them the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, that He declared to them, in addition, that they knew that after two days would be the feast of the Passover—that then should the Son of man be betrayed, and by treachery be brought to the cross.

In His heart it was also entirely determined, that on the third day, reckoned from that evening, He would approach to Jerusalem with them; and it was plain before His eyes what

awaited Him there. He indicated the leading features of His passion: the betrayal and the cross, He said, were before Him. He was to experience the betrayal from the Jews; the crucifixion by the hands of the heathens.

The Evangelists bring it out thoroughly, that it was just at this time that the Sanhedrim once again held a session to discuss further its plans against Jesus. We easily conceive what might induce the enemies of Jesus, thus late in the evening, to hold another meeting to consider the question of the day. Jesus had on that day humbled them in the temple; He had brought all their projects of ensnaring Him in a capital charge by His words—to disgrace. He had given them in the temple, before the eyes of the people, a signal defeat, whose result was unbearable to them. They appeared now to be made altogether helpless, unless they were willing to take extreme measures. Thus they could no longer lay themselves quietly down to sleep; they would and must, first of all, come to a decided determination.

They came together in this disposition, by Matthew's account, in as large numbers as possible—the chief priests and the scribes, and the elders of the people. The sitting was probably a confidential one, and did not take place in the council-room on the temple mountain,[1] but in the hall of the high priest Caiaphas. At this discussion it was from the first agreed that they would kill Jesus; the question was, *How?* In reference to this question, at first they came together in a state of the greatest excitement, and in the first impulse of zeal they would probably have gladly decided to have Him seized on the spot. But by degrees the scruples with which many in their body were filled, suggested themselves in their full power. They knew the mind of the people. Probably, indeed, the victory which Jesus had gained on that day over them had, in an extraordinary degree, increased His consideration among the people, and, on the other hand, had proportionably damaged their own reputation among them. Under the influence of such events, they decided to avoid forcible and hasty measures; and accordingly to take Jesus prisoner with craft, and therefore secretly, in order to hand him over to death most quickly. But with this intention they were compelled to wait for a more suitable opportunity. They must first allow the festal pilgrims to have departed again from Jerusalem before

[1] Upon this council chamber the Conclave-Gazith, see Friedlieb, 8.

taking any step towards the carrying out of their intentions. 'Not on the feast day.' Thus negatively, in some degree decided the fanatical council in their irresolution.

It is a marvellous concurrence of circumstances, that while the Sanhedrim was holding council upon the decision which was to put Jesus to death, *He* Himself was seated on the Mount of Olives in the circle of His disciples, and was announcing to them the doom which was to come upon Jerusalem as a prognostic of the future judgment of the world. The evening hours in which these events stand side by side with one another, belong to the most significant in the history of the world.

Moreover, we see in a second contrast the peculiar brilliancy with which the Prince of Light excels the children of darkness. The members of the Sanhedrim are found in the most manifest perplexity and insecurity with their schemes. They were not yet aware that Jesus, on the next paschal day, would die on the cross by their hands. They rather purpose that He should come to that result at a later period; yea, they actually come now to a decision, according to which the crucifixion was not to happen at the Passover at all. But they are ignorant that they have made themselves, by their resolve to kill Jesus, helpless tools of hell and of Satan, and that the powers of darkness will overthrow their determination. In hell it is said, 'Yes, even at the feast;' and this conclusion soon finds an echo in the soul of Judas. The fathers grown grey in sin did not anticipate that a traitor from the band of disciples would hurry them along in his demoniacal excitement to put the Lord to death at the feast. Still less could they anticipate that even the eternal wisdom of God had decreed, in a sense altogether opposed to that of hell, that the crucifixion was to take place *at the feast.*

Jesus, however, clearly beholds His destiny in the mirror of eternal wisdom. And while the darkened college, notwithstanding its decrees, and with all the glasses of political sagacity, cannot see an inch before them, He can declare His fate to His disciples with the fullest certainty, that after two days He shall be betrayed and crucified at the Passover at Jerusalem.

To all appearance, we have no intelligence whatever of the Wednesday in Passion week. Thus this day forms a remarkably serious and calm pause in His life, assuredly filled with deep spiritual preparation for His end.

When the day of unleavened bread began,—the day of the preparation of the Passover feast,—Jesus had made no arrangement where and how He would celebrate it in Jerusalem. Possibly He delayed it intentionally, until the disciples, in their Israelitish notion of festal arrangements, thought now is the time to consider of the Easter feast, and till they expressed themselves about it to Him, asking, 'Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Passover?'

According to the three first Evangelists, it is distinctly asserted that Christ kept the Passover at the same time as the rest of the Israelites; for the eating of the unleavened bread began with the day on which the paschal lamb was slain—on the 14th Nisan.[1] This day, on which the lamb is put to death,[2] is the day immediately before the celebration of the Passover. Moreover, it is well to be considered that the Lord arranged and celebrated the Passover upon the suggestion of His disciples. It is scarcely to be supposed that the disciples would have proposed to Him any deviation from the custom.

Moreover, John agrees with the statement of the three first Evangelists, as was shown above,[3] and has been lately in many ways confirmed. Jesus separated the two disciples Peter and John from the rest, with the commission to go into the city and to arrange the preparations for the feast.

The direction in detail sounds very mysterious, precisely in a similar manner to that with which a short time before He had sent forth two disciples from Bethany to bring Him an ass's colt on which to ride. He did not indicate to them the man by name to whom they should address themselves in Jerusalem, that they might obtain a room at his house for the Passover. He rather made it manifest that He only wished to designate him obscurely. 'Go into the city to such a man' (*πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα*), it is said; then follows the sign: 'Immediately at the entry into the city,' He says, 'there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water.' Him they were to follow into the

[1] Ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα (Luke xxii. 7).

[2] Friedlieb, *Archæologie*, 44. With the beginning of the 14th Nisan (thus on the evening after the 13th) began the removing of the leavened bread. Still even to the fourth hour of this day leavened bread might be made use of. Compare Wieseler, *Chronolog. Synops.*, 345.

[3] See above, p. 22, and vol. i. p. 199.

house into which he should enter. And they were to regard the master of that house as the unnamed one to whom He sends them. To him they were to deliver the message, 'The Master saith unto you, Where is the guest-chamber where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples?' The Lord added, 'And he will show you a large upper room, furnished with cushions; there make ready for us the Passover.'

The marvel of this fact is, first of all, plainly manifested in the certainty of the spiritual glance of Christ, by which He can predict to the disciples that at the appointed time, and in the appointed place, that man shall meet them whom He would give to them for a sign.

As far as concerns the owner of the house that was thus visited, it must be supposed that the Lord had probably been on friendly and confidential terms with him, as with the unnamed friend in Bethphage.[1] Still an absolute agreement previously is not to be assumed here any more than in the former case. But the Lord had read into the soul of this man, and was certain of his disposition in this case and for this event. This certainly is the second matter of marvel in this place; it subsists even although it is supposed that there had been previous intercourse between Jesus and the man, to which intercourse the present message of Jesus referred.

But here also there must needs be alleged some definite reason for which Christ chose this mysterious form, as He had done at Bethphage, when He sent for the ass's colt. And this much is plain, if He had closely indicated the feast-chamber in the presence of Judas, Judas would have been able to leave His company earlier, and to betray Him to His enemies at an unseasonable time. Although he betrayed the Lord later in Gethsemane, yet he came thither by his own conjecture, and Jesus had not co-operated with him for that purpose. But if at this time Jesus had let fall a hint which could have made it possible for him to surprise Him in the Passover-chamber, He would have rendered the treacherous work more easy through a want of caution. This was not to be: thus Jesus availed Himself at

[1] ['This supposition seems justified by the peculiar use of the words specified by all the three synoptical Evangelists, ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, and still more by the peculiar and confidential terms of the message.' Ellicott, 321, note.—ED.]

once of the security of His wonderful foreknowledge, and of the carefulness of the most accurate foresight. Moreover, at the same time again appears the childlike, almost playful, serenity and condescension wherewith He supplies the earthly necessity in the moment of need. The disciples might perchance have thought that it was already much too late to find a good place of shelter for the celebration of the Passover; it could hardly be anticipated that they would still succeed in such a purpose, in any degree, as they would wish. But He gives them the promise, that immediately on their entrance into the city they should find a lodging—that at a word from Him it should all be at once arranged to their liking—that a handsome guest-chamber, a large cushioned upper room, should stand prepared for their reception.

The disciples, thus commissioned, went forth and found as the Lord had said. They thus prepared the feast in the usual manner—procuring, slaying, and cleaning the paschal lamb, and providing the other materials of the festival. The banquet room, they had already found prepared.

NOTES.

1. It is not a very well founded conclusion drawn by Neander (418) from the decision of the Sanhedrim not to apprehend Christ at the feast, that consequently He had been taken prisoner *before the Passover*—that thus, finally, He did not celebrate the Passover with the Jews. The objection which Neander himself alleges seems to weaken the observation. 'We might suppose that the Sanhedrim were led, by the opportunity afforded them by one of the disciples, to seize Jesus quietly by night, abandoning their original design.' But besides, the Evangelists most evidently wish to bring out the contrast between the clear foresight of Christ and the gloomy uncertainty of the Sanhedrim. Moreover, it is to be considered that the motive, '*lest there be an uproar among the people*,' would have been sufficient to exclude *the day before the feast*, just as much as the actual day of the feast.

2. Neander also, in the fourth edition of his work, has continued to adopt the view of Ideler, Lücke, Sieffert, De Wette, and Bleek, according to which Christ must have kept the feast with the disciples, not on the 14th, but on the 13th Nisan;

wherein, moreover, he assumes a difference between John, who is made to maintain this view, and the Synoptists who represent the Lord as keeping the proper Passover. Most of the reasons alleged by Neander have already been discussed; but when it is put forward as remarkable, that the Jews should have purposed an execution on the first day of the feast, we may surely explain this by a simple reference to the immense pressure of circumstances, or rather to their slavish fanaticism in correspondence with the circumstances. And in this point of view it is rightly regarded. How often the passion of fanaticism overthrows the institutions of fanaticism! The passage referred to further in Luke xxiii. 54, does not make the day on which Jesus died appear such a one 'on which there could be no scruples about undertaking any kind of business.' For although the day had been even indicated as the eve of the Sabbath, or the Friday (ἡμέρα παρασκευῆς), and although of the Sabbath it had been said that the women remained at rest on that day, according to the commandment, it would not follow that they worked on the Friday. They did not in their state of mind consider it as a profanation of the festival, to prepare spices in the rest time, even on Friday evening. It may perhaps be supposed that this preparation lasted even into the evening (and thus even on to the Sabbath itself), since the Sabbath was already breaking when they returned from the grave of Jesus. And if, nevertheless, they abstained on the following day from anointing their Lord—in this mind—it was not consideration for the religious, but for the social, aspect of the Sabbath institution, that hindered them; and thus for the Sabbath institution in the feeling of the people. That Apollinaris of Hierapolis has referred to the Gospel of John to prove that the last supper of Jesus was no proper passover feast, only serves to show that already in his time, as well as now, it was possible for people to believe that they found the interpretation in question in the Gospel. Finally, as to the expression of Polycrates of Ephesus (Euseb. v. 24), it must be well established, that in the controversy about Easter there was no question at all about the day of the death of Christ (of which, according to Neander, Polycrates must be speaking), but about the celebration of the paschal feast. But it must still further be brought out here: 1st, That according to the Synoptists it was the disciples who reminded the Lord of the celebration of the Passover. Such an observation cannot have,

been made without reason. But could the disciples have urged the Lord to a premature celebration? 2dly, It is to be considered that a matter of legal importance must have been in question, to have induced the Lord to return to Jerusalem to the Passover, under the circumstances that were then prevailing, after He had solemnly forsaken the temple. This argument has perhaps a very great weight for him who takes into due account the theocratic and Christologic relations of the evangelic history.

3. Seyffart, in his pamphlet '*Theologia Sacra*,' 128, supposes that Christ died on the cross on Thursday, the 14th Nisan, and rose again from the dead on the Sunday. But still it is plainly made out that the Gospels only place one day between the evening of the burial of Jesus and the morning of His resurrection. Compare Luke xxiii. 55, 56; xxiv. 1. And if the tradition in the Talmud be maintained, that Christ was crucified on the evening of the Passover, could the evening of the Passover be the evening of the 14th Nisan, as Seyffart supposes? The Israelite knows a twofold evening, namely, the natural one and the chronologic one. The chronologic evening is the decline of the day, the natural one is the nightfall; in a certain sense, the morning of the chronological day then beginning. When it was thus decreed that the paschal lamb must be put to death *between the evenings*, it was probably meant between the chronological evening, or the decline of day of the 14th Nisan, and the natural evening, or the nightfall of the 15th Nisan. Consequently, in a chronologic sense, the evening of the Passover would thus be the afternoon of the 15th Nisan, or of the Passover feast. [The expression 'between the evenings' has received a variety of interpretations, even by the Jewish writers themselves. Their opinions are cited in their own words by Bynæus (*De Morte Christi*, i. 518–21). He himself adopts the view of the Pharisees in the time of Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 3), that the first evening began when the sun declined, the second when it set; that the period referred to was therefore from three to five or six P.M. Kurtz (*Hist. of Old Cov.* ii. 301) adopts the view of the Karaites and Samaritans, referring the expression to the period from sunset to dark. Jarchi and Kimchi think that the time meant is from a little before to a little after sunset, or the afternoon and evening.—ED.]

SECTION II.

THE FOOT-WASHING. THE PASSOVER. THE INSTITUTION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION. THE PARTING WORDS OF THE LORD. THE HIGH-PRIESTLY PRAYER. THE GOING OUT INTO THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

(Matt. xxvi. 20–35; Mark xiv. 17–31; Luke xxii. 14–39; John xiii.–xvii.)

It was not yet six o'clock in the evening on the 14th Nisan, when Jesus with His disciples arrived at the room where those who had preceded them had made ready the Passover.[1]

The company at once sate down—the Lord and His disciples. The supper was already beginning,[2] although as yet no resource had been found to supply a want which, according to the Israelitish institution, ought now to be provided for. The festal company, namely, were seated with unwashen feet; and yet they ought to have their feet washed before they could begin the festival with undistracted festal feeling.[3] Even although

[1] Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα. It is thus that John defines this moment. It is not possible that this is meant merely as a general intimation of the time—perhaps it was intended to convey that the feast-time had not yet begun. This word must rather be taken with the notice that follows further on—that Jesus knew that His hour was come; further still with the intimation, ver. 29, according to which some thought that Jesus had urged Judas to make haste to provide purchases for the feast, and with the subsequent remark of the Evangelist, ἦν δὲ νύξ. Thus we obtain the general view of John as to the time. Jesus sate down with the disciples before sunset, undertook the foot-washing, and began the Passover with the disciples. This was just the time when it was neither quite day nor night. But when Judas went out it was already night.

[2] Probably this is the meaning here of δείπνου γενομένου. [For examples of this use of the Aorist, see Lightfoot or Alford, *in loc.* Tischendorf and Meyer read γινομένου, which gives the same meaning.—Ed.]

[3] [It does not appear, from anything adduced by commentators, that washing the feet was customary before a meal, though it was the first mark of hospitality given to a guest off a journey. The quotations cited by Lightfoot show that foot-washing was the work of a slave, but do not show its propriety before a feast. Lampe thinks that, at the paschal feast, which was eaten by those who had their staves in their hands, and their shoes on their feet, as if starting on a journey and not finishing one, there is a diffi-

the master of the house was devoted to the Lord, yet it may be easily explained how, in the hurry of this day, or busied with His own Passover feast, He might have forgotten to care for this matter. But among the disciples themselves, it occurred to none to undertake this business of caring for their associates. Nay, it may perhaps be reasonably supposed[1] that the necessity had been spoken of among them, but that nobody would resolve to undertake in humility the lowly office. In this manner they may have arrived again unconsciously at the dispute about their relations of rank; and thus even at the last supper the controversy would be again renewed, which among them was the greatest. Probably this led the Evangelist Luke to unite this controversy with the narrative of the last supper, which it follows.[2]

There was thus an actual historical impulse which induced the Lord to undertake the foot-washing. That is to say, the foot-washing was not entirely symbolic, but primarily real; an act of real humility and voluntary service. This truth, indeed, does not militate against its being at the same time represented as a symbol, and treated as a symbol by the Lord.

Thus they were already seated at the table, and already was the supper about to begin, when the foot-washing was still unprovided for. Already they begin to raise some perplexity about it. Then the Lord addressed Himself to conduct the business.

John apprehended this fact as the last great proof of love which the Lord gave to His disciples before His exit from the world; which He gave them, notwithstanding that the band of disciples was already defiled by the treasonable project of Judas; notwithstanding that His soul was already filled with the presentiment of His transition to glory with the Father. On the threshold of the throne of glory He still washed His disciples' feet; a company in whose midst sate the traitor with the design of the black deed—with the devil in his heart.

And how easily and calmly He addressed Himself to the new service! He stands up, lays aside the upper garment, binds around Him a linen napkin, pours water into the basin,

culty in seeing its propriety. May it not have been used on this occasion, because our Lord and His disciples had been journeying, though but a short distance?—Ed.]

[1] Ebrard, 400.

[2] Luke xxii. 24–30.

and begins to wash the disciples' feet, and to dry them with the napkin.

Thus He comes to Peter also. We gather generally throughout this notice of the Evangelist, that in all probability He cannot have begun with Peter.[1] He refuses to allow so great a manifestation of grace to be made to Him. 'Lord, dost Thou wash my feet?' Jesus requires submission, and promises subsequent explanation: 'What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.' The disciple thinks that He is maintaining his humility and reverence for Jesus in a special measure, in speaking a word which testifies of want of humility and hard self-will against the Lord—a word of decided opposition. 'Lord, Thou shalt never wash my feet.' He thus, in fact, was placing his whole relation to Jesus in jeopardy; and with heavenly severity must the Lord have expressed the word of the highest heavenly mildness: 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in Me.'

This is the strongest expression of the Gospel in the strongest form of legality, just as Peter needed it when he with hard determination established his position against the fulness of the Gospel.

Christ washes His disciples; washes their feet, makes them clean: thus they obtain part in Him; thus they become redeemed.

Against that which was humbling in this heavenly humility of free grace, the mind of Peter struggles in false humility. He will maintain against the Lord an apparently more humble, but a substantially prouder position. 'Thou shalt never wash my feet,' says the disciple Simon, son of Jonas, as the type of a certain tendency in the Church. He says it so loudly, that it echoes through the ages.

But the Lord sets will against will; law against law. He gives even to the Gospel of His grace a legal expression, as against this principle.

Still the characteristic of freedom remains. He does not

[1] [For the various and strange arrangements made by ancient interpreters, see Lampe *in loc.* Those 'in the Romish interest' suppose the ceremony to have begun with Peter; but so also Ewald, Alford, and others. It seems impossible to decide whether the οὖν of ver. 6 indicates the 'pursuance of the intention' expressed by ἤρξατο, or not. Meyer thinks it does not.—ED.]

constrain Peter; He leaves it to him to consider whether he will have part in Him or not. But if he wishes to have part in Him, he must reconcile himself to the majesty of his Master, even to the majesty of His ministering love.

The absolute word of the Master breaks down the opposition of the disciple; but still it does not fully break down his self-will. He answers, 'Lord, not my feet only, but my hands and my head.' Thus once more, out of the word of submission, springs up a last convulsion of self-will. He will now again have something according to his own mind, over and above the mind of Christ; a more elaborate ceremonial of foot-washing, not the simply expressive foot-washing of Christ.

Jesus answers him: 'He who is washed needeth not, save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.'

That was the theocratic privilege in Israel. According to the law of washing, he who could claim to be pure was substantially only bound to wash his feet on coming from the street and wishing to take part in a banquet—theocratically pure. But here Christ expresses the word in its religious significance. The disciples were washed for the festival of the new covenant, by the baptism of John, and by their believing entry into the fellowship of Christ. They had embraced, by their faith in Him, the principle which purified their life. Thus they needed no other washing than this daily purification from daily pollutions, by means of continually new manifestations of the grace of Jesus, conditioned upon daily repentance and submission to His will.

It is perhaps not without significance that the Lord spoke this word to Peter. The church which refers itself to him is always wishing, after their legal meaning, to wash the hands and the heads of those who are already washed.

'And ye are clean,' said Jesus further, consolingly to the disciples; but he added, with meaning, 'but not all.' This He said, as John observes, with reference to His betrayer.

When He had finished the washing, He put on again His upper garment, sate down, and began to explain to them His conduct. 'Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call Me Master and Lord: and ye do well; for so I am. If, then, I, your Master and Lord, have washed your feet, ye ought also

to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do unto one another as I have done unto you.'

And if the Lord, on this occasion, cries 'Verily, verily!' to add force to the word, 'The servant is not greater than his Lord, and the apostle not greater than He that sent him,' it is because this assertion is of the deepest importance. Wherever Christ is to recognise once more pure Christianity, He will behold it again in servants, in scholars, who are subordinated to Him in this respect as well as others. Such servants or apostles as exalt themselves over those whose feet He has washed, He cannot acknowledge as His apostles or as His servants.

This saying is not to be confused with the similar one, in which He calls His disciples to suffer with Him (Matt. x. 24).

Moreover, the Lord well knew, that it is much easier to apply this doctrine in theory than in practice—easier to represent it in poetry than in life—*more convenient in merely symbolic medals, than in the actual current coin of life.*[1] Therefore He adds, 'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.'

The Evangelist Luke also informs us of these exhortations of Jesus, but in a less definite form (chap. xxii. 24–27).

Now, moreover, Jesus tells them why He had wished to manifest Himself to them as a servant. After He has put them to shame, He will again cheer them: 'Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations. And I assure unto you, by an institution (by the Lord's Supper), the kingdom, as My Father hath assured it unto Me. Ye are to eat and drink at My table in the kingdom of the Father.' Thus He appoints unto them His own inheritance. In the kingdom of the Father they are not only to be *His companions in the kingdom*—not only His house-*companions*, but His *table-friends*. Thus they are to come to full enjoyment with Him of *His* blessedness. This is to be their position inwardly. But outwardly, 'Ye shall sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' In the kingdom of reality they are, as spiritual powers, to rule over, to appoint, and to lead the glorified humanity with Him. Here, probably, he would connect the word which John records in another association: 'I speak not of you all; for I know whom

[1] [The acute remark of Bengel will be remembered: 'Magis admirandus foret pontifex, unius regis, quam duodecim pauperum pedes, seria humilitate lavans.'—ED.]

I have chosen: I know My election. But it cannot be otherwise—thus it must be,' He appears to mean further on, as He continues: 'For the Scripture must be fulfilled.' Even the word, 'He that eateth My bread, lifteth up his heel against Me,'[1] is purposing to raise his foot against Me.

That bitter experience which David went through in his flight from Absalom, that Ahithophel, his confidential counsellor, was a traitor to him, he recorded in an utterance which served for an unconscious typical prophecy of the treachery of Judas.

But wherefore did the Lord make this disclosure to the disciples? Himself declares the reason: 'Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe on Me.' If they had kept the full meaning of this word, even the treacherous sign itself, which Judas gave to the enemies in Gethsemane, would have been the strongest assurance to their faith. In this betrayal itself, if they had acknowledged the glory of their Lord in His prescience, this testimony of His glory would have been to them a consoling pillar of fire, deep in the awful midnight; and they would have taken heart for watchfulness in the hour of grievous temptation.

Thus far the discourse may have progressed before the beginning of the Supper. What, according to John, was said besides, is doubtless connected with the Passover itself.

The Paschal feast[2] was substantially a double feast—as festival of the pascha (Pass-over) of exemption,[3] and as a festival of unleavened bread[4] or the bread of affliction,[5] combined with the eating of bitter herbs[6] and the enjoyment of the cup of thanksgiving. But both feasts were associated into one, by their essential relation to the one fact of the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt. A third occasion of the festival was less essential, namely, the celebration of the commencement of harvest. This last fact represented the reconciliation and association between the theocratic life and the nature-life of the people of Israel.

The Passover, in the narrowest sense, is of a sadly-joyous

[1] Ps. xli. 10. [2] Exod. xii. [3] פֶּסַח, πάσχα.
[4] חַג הַמַּצּוֹת, ἑορτὴ των ἀζύμων. [5] לֶחֶם עֹנִי.
[6] מְרֹרִים, πικρίδες. Endives—wild lettuce.

kind. It is related to the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt, which could only be effected by means of a great twofold sacrifice, by which Israel must be separated from the Egyptians. The first sacrifice occurred in a terrible manner. It was a *real* (although only a preliminary) atonement—the judgment of God upon the Egyptian first-born—the actual judgment, *which exempted none*, in which the first-born of Egypt as the sin-offering, or as the sin itself, was blotted out. The second side was the thank-offering, which the Israelites brought when they slaughtered the lamb, and struck the blood of the sacrifice on the door-posts, to serve to the destroying angel, who was passing round without, for a sign, that he might pass over the houses of the children of Israel: thus the offering of thanksgiving was for this passing over, by which the exemption was declared. *The proper Easter feast thus refers back, as a feast of thank-offering, to a reconciliation already effected, in which the sin-offering and the thank-offering are already brought.*

The Passover lamb of the Jews, moreover, had from the beginning a twofold relation. It was related, first, as a feast of thank-offering, back to the terrible sacrifice of judgment, to the sin-offering by which God had redeemed Israel out of Egypt, when He brought destruction on the first-born of Egypt. But the theocratic spirit knew that this redemption was itself only typical—that the true essential redemption of the true essential Israel was still to come. As, therefore, that redemption had been a typical suggestion of this real redemption, so also the Passover feast was a suggestion of a real reconciliation,—thus, also, of a great and real sin-offering, and of a great and real thank-offering which should be related to that sin-offering. It was thus a suggestion of the death of Christ.

The death of Christ embraces both kinds of offering in its reality—the actual sin-offering and the actual thank-offering.

His people thrust Him out and killed Him, as if He were the very sin itself,—the actual curse,—as if He must perish in order that the people might be saved in the sense of Caiaphas. Thus in the eyes of Israel He resembled the first-born of Egypt, which had been formerly destroyed. But God did actually thus allow Him to be made sin and a sin-offering. Yea, He Himself made Him so in another and a heavenly sense, by

suffering Him to die, as the true and sinless first-born of His people, for the sins of the people.[1]

But because Christ thus, as the sinless one, died for the sinner, His death was not for Him perdition or destruction; but it became His liberation out of the Israelitish house of bondage, the transfiguration of His life into a new life: and thus He also became the life of His new people, the life of the faithful. Thus the sin-offering, because it had no sin in itself, became altogether a thank-offering, and hence a festival nourishment of the life of the Church of Christ. Thus Christ is the veritable Passover Lamb.

Both the aspects of the Passover—the mournful one which subsisted in its reference to a foregone judgment, as well as the joyous one which was expressed in its representation of the certainty of exemption and deliverance—were manifested plainly in the form and manner in which the feast was held. The lamb of a year old was roasted just as it was killed, without being dismembered. It was consumed by one family, which consisted variously of members of the household, and of those who were associated as friends,—thus of an actual family which enlarged itself into an ideal one. The celebrants ate it originally in travelling costume, standing, their staves in their hands (Exod. xii. 11). In all, there was expressed the midnight alarm of judgment, to which this celebration was due: the hardly surmounted anxiety, the great excitement in which they passed over from the deepest necessity and danger by God's gracious exemption, to the joy of an unexpected and yet so certain deliverance. The eating of bitter herbs, which preceded the meal and accompanied it, pointed still farther back to the sufferings which the people had endured in Egypt. But still the deliverance was the prominent thing. It expressed itself in the eating of the thank-offering, in the uniting into families of larger groups of people who celebrated the Passover together.

With this sadly joyous feast, however, is associated, in an inward unity, the *joyously mournful* festival of unleavened bread. From the great deliverance itself proceeds, namely, the enfranchisement, which, however, first of all, is a flight into the wilderness, in which the people must partake of a bread unleavened—a bread of affliction. This aspect of the future deli-

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13.

verance—the enfranchisement of the people, as a flight out into the privations of the wilderness—is represented by the feast of unleavened bread. The eating of unleavened bread indicates, first of all, the complete separation from the Egyptian condition —all the leaven of the Egyptians has been cleansed out.[1] Connected with that is the indication of this partaking as of a holy thing; for the temple bread, which was offered before Jehovah, was unleavened.[2] Thirdly (as partaking of the bread of affliction, of bread that was less palatable), it points to the hurry and flight of the departure, and the privation which the people after their enfranchisement had still to endure in the wilderness. But the special reality of the celebration was still illustrated by the spirit of joy and of thanksgiving. The four cups of wine especially expressed this, which, according to the developed paschal rite, the father of the family handed round in distinct pauses with words of thankfulness; still more, the song of praise with which this partaking was accompanied.[3]

When the Lord sate down, after the foot-washing, to begin the festival in the midst of His disciples, He said, 'With desire I have desired[4] to eat this passover with you before I suffer.' This word attains its full importance for us when we reflect that Jesus beheld in the supper the celebration of His own appointed death, and the heavenly fruit of that death. How resolute, how decided must His soul have been, to be able to long painfully for such a celebration! If we conceive of the interest of Christ in the celebration of the Passover, as from His childhood upward it occurred annually, we cannot but suppose that from year to year this commemoration affected Him more seriously, with deeper significance, more painfully, and more happily. From year to year the thought must have more clearly disclosed itself to Him in this solemnity, that He Himself was the proper and real Passover Lamb. How often would His soul quake, His countenance grow pale, and wear the most speaking expression of a presentiment that deeply agitated Him, when He celebrated this festival in the company of His disciples! Yet at this last celebration, at which the keeping of the Passover was to Him, in the most special sense, the festal eve of His death, He could speak the wondrous word, that He had desired it with desire.

[1] Matt. xvi. 6; 1 Cor. v. 8. [2] Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultûs*, i. 432.
[3] Ps. cxiii.–cxviii. [4] Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα.

But what in this case chiefly affects Him is, according to Luke, the distinct presentiment of His victory and His glory: 'For I say unto you,' said He, 'I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled—find its full fulfilment—in the Father's kingdom.' With these words, He appears to consecrate the meal of the sacrificial flesh. He points onward to the real fulfilment of this type, to the heavenly Lord's Supper, the perfect enjoyment of blessedness in His kingdom. Then they were to be in perfect enjoyment of the food—which is identical with His life—of His life sacrificed and consecrated by the sacrifice, and of His heavenly manifestation. Therewith He unites the distribution of the first cup under the usual thanksgiving with the words, 'Take this, and divide it among you; for I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God shall come.' As thus the real fulfilling of the paschal lamb shall be given for the enjoyment of His people in the future appearance of the Lord, so is the real fulfilling of the cup of thanksgiving to consist in the future manifestation of the glory of the Church, next to the joy of the Lord.

Thus Christ refers first of all to the real and eternal antitype of the paschal feast, to the everlasting banquet of the kingdom of His glorified Church, to the glorious form of the eternal Lord's Supper, whose precursor in the New Testament communion feast He is now purposing to establish. He thus hands them the cup, as a farewell until that highest reunion.

But we learn how this reunion is to be effected when we turn again to John. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you,' said the Lord, 'he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me.' Thus speaking He shuddered deeply, remembering that Judas still sate among His disciples, and thus still seemingly belonged to His messengers, and that thus it might *appear* as if He had spoken this great word of promise of him also.

Against the possibility of this application of His word, His heavenly sense of truth revolted, which made it altogether impossible to allow the traitor to take part in the promises which subsequently He had to communicate, and to confirm to the disciples. Thereupon it is declared that, upon the assurance, 'Verily, verily, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me,'

follows anew an assertion which John expressively characterizes as a testimony of the Lord, as a protestation which He made with great mental agitation of spirit: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, That one of you shall betray Me.' 'One who eateth with Me,' is said besides in Mark; 'The hand of My betrayer is with Me on the table,' it is said in Luke.

The disciples looked on one another in perplexity; their looks asked one another whom He means; they were sore troubled, and began to make inquiry who it might be. 'Lord, is it I?' individuals began to ask; and this question ran round the company. With this question they repented of the spirit of worldliness in which they had themselves been so long standing, and in which they had fostered the serpent of treachery in their bosom, in giving confidence to the traitor in conducting him—as we must perhaps assume—to the Lord, and in having so long in their blindness esteemed him highly.

This blindness John had not shared; the dark nature of Judas appears to have been deeply repugnant to him. He lay, as the confidant of Jesus, on His breast at the feast.[1] Therefore Simon Peter signed to him to find out who the betrayer was. Then John leans his head on the breast of Jesus, and asks Him. Jesus gave the intimation in such a way that, according to Matthew, all *could* understand;[2] but still, according

[1] The guests leant upon the left hand at the table, and were thus turned towards their neighbours on the right. Consequently, John sat on the right hand of Jesus.

[2] [The narrative seems rather to require that we should suppose the answer of our Lord, given in Matthew, to be still general, and not specifically to indicate Judas. Our Lord first of all announces that He is to be betrayed by one of them; on this they ask, 'Lord, is it I?' To this He replies in words that depict the general standing of the traitor. He tells them that it is 'one of the twelve,' one who was then at table, and eating with Him. It was necessary to insert this general description, for the sake of exhibiting the fulfilment of Ps. xli., and of prolonging the self-examination of the disciples. After that, Peter signs to John to ask the Lord who was meant in particular; and the answer seems to be given to John alone [so Bynæus, i. 437: "Johannes rogaverat voce submissiori, quisnam esset ille homo nefarius . . . Jesus submissa itidem voce indicaverat.' He also quotes Theophylact, to the effect that had Peter heard who the traitor was, he would speedily have drawn his ready sword and made an end of him], and to be overheard by Judas, who was certainly sitting close to Jesus. The sign which Jesus had specified, not the general ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος which applied to all, but the definite ᾧ ἐγω βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῳ,

to John, all do not appear actually to have understood exactly. 'He it is to whom I shall give the morsel when I have dipped it.'[1] Hereupon He dipped the morsel and gave it to Judas Iscariot. Jesus added the terribly solemn words intelligibly to all. the disciples: 'The Son of Man goeth indeed as it is written of Him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! it were better for him that he had never been born.'

It is immeasurable ruin and immeasurable curse which He thus indicates. Moreover, the woe which He invokes upon Judas is a deep woe to His soul. He is deeply moved to pity for that man, even for his birth. He fears for the time and eternity of that man so deeply, that He can forget His own woe, which that man is preparing for Him, in his misery; all the more that He knows that that reprobate one can design nothing else for Him than what the Father has ordained for Him. 'The Son of Man goeth as it is written of Him.'

Such a word of thunder had now become necessary for the heart of the disciple. Judas had, as it appears, hitherto been silent during the self-trial of the disciples—in gloomy reserve. But now he gathered himself up with a most terrible effort, under this overwhelming word of Christ, which plainly enough pointed to him as the most unhappy man. He took the morsel, as if nothing had happened to him, and asked, 'Master, is it I?' Therewith it was all over with him. Up to that point his soul had still played with the counsel of hell. Now this counsel played with him. 'After the sop,' says John, 'Satan entered into him.' He retained indeed, even now, the formal freedom and control of his consciousness, and in that respect he was distinguished from demoniacs. But his moral liberty he had altogether surrendered to the influence and dominion of Satan the prince of darkness, and as his slavish instrument he was now driven out into the night. He had become the point of

is now accomplished. He gives the sop to Judas, and Judas asks, 'Lord, is it I?' This course of events seems best to satisfy every part of the narrative.—ED.]

[1] Or, who dips his hand with Me in the dish. The handing of the morsel took place, probably, over the dish. Or perhaps Judas, in his mental excitement, would anticipate that which was remarkable in this transfer by hastening with his hand to meet the hand of the Lord, and receiving the morsel while it was still in the dish.

union of all the dark powers of earth and hell. He flew like a whirring arrow of the evil one to wound the heart of his Master to death—the heart of Jesus. Jesus answered his desperate question, 'Thou hast said;' and added, 'What thou doest, do quickly.'

He did not thus bid him do what possibly he was still not willing to do; but *to do quickly* what he had *entirely* resolved to do. There need be no difficulty here; the question is merely of the form of the address. As if, for example, a human sacrifice under the knife of his destroyer were to ask him to put him to death speedily.

What thou wilt do, do quickly. These words were an indirect banishment of the traitor out of the company of the disciples. They might suggest many thoughts as to the true form of true, actual excommunication. Jesus only insists upon the publicity of the decision—on the open consequence of the secret consequence of evil—on the bringing to light of the position already determined on by the traitor; and therewith the result follows of itself.

John gives us a profound glance into the awful spiritual significance of the situation. Only the traitor understood the great saying of Jesus, and he, indeed, only in the deepest misconception. Of the others who sate at meat with Him not one understood it at all; some of them were altogether mistaken in it, thinking that, because Judas carried the money-bag, Jesus had given him a commission possibly to buy as soon as might be what was necessary for the feast, or to provide for a gift for the poor. How discouraging must such an interpretation of the word of Jesus in this company, after this conversation, appear! It belongs to the many contributions which the disciples have made to the characterization of a pre-pentecostal exegesis.

As certainly, however, as these disciples did not understand the lofty heroic spirit in the word of Christ, as little did they conceive the satanic meaning with which the traitor took in the word. It was thus to them, in a peculiar sense, an enigma, when their ancient comrade rose up as soon as he had received the sop, and quickly went out. 'And it was night,' writes John, with a slight reference possibly to the mistaken notion of the disciples, that purchases for the feast could be made so late; but at the same time, certainly, with the full feeling of the sig-

nificance of what he was saying in respect of the position of Judas,—he went out into the night.[1]

Thus, in this spiritual emergency, in which He was cutting off the miserable son of perdition, in a purely spiritual and public manner, from His disciples, Jesus stood most absolutely alone, although surrounded by His disciples. They did not fully apprehend the fearful aversion of Christ's Spirit from the spirit of Judas—the shudder of heavenly purity of their Master at the frightful impurity of the traitor; and the triumph of Christ's spiritual peace and serenity over the dark semblance of peace and self-assertion of the revolted and faithless disciple. It was as if a battle of giants had been fought out over the heads of children; for Judas had attained the age of manhood in evil much more rapidly than the disciples had attained it in good. He was able now to strive as a representative of the prince of darkness with the Lord. The struggle declared itself in the disposition, in the aversion, in the glance, in the mien of both the combatants. But John felt most of all the horror of the moment. He anticipated the glory of his Master in the heavenly calm wherewith He drove out the Satan from the company of His disciples, so quietly, so composedly, that the greater part of the disciples did not immediately perceive it. Yes, possibly the high-thoughted disciple for the first time conceived the entire impression of the terrible greatness of the spiritual night upon earth, and of the symbolical significance of the earthly night, when he saw at this time the son of night stagger forth into the black darkness; even as he possibly for the first time then appreciated the greatness of his Lord's glory, who overcame the night as the Prince of Light.

[1] [The question whether or not Judas was present at the institution of the Eucharist has been very much discussed, and has been connected with the dogmatic question of the spiritual efficacy of the sacraments. The very great majority of the Fathers and the Schoolmen, and some of the Reformers, were of opinion that Judas did not leave the paschal supper until a later period, and received along with the others the symbols of the Lord's body and blood. Among recent commentators, however, Stier and Alford are almost alone in their advocacy of this view. Neander, Meyer, Ebrard, Lichtenstein, Riggenbach, Ellicott, and Andrews, agree with the author in thinking that it was not till Judas left the company that the communion was instituted. A full account of the patristic and mediæval opinions on this point is given by Bynaeus, *De Morte Jesu Christi*, Amstel. 1691–8, vol. i. 443–8.—Ed.]

For that the Lord had at this moment gained a great triumph, is indicated by the rejoicing words of exultation into which He breaks forth as soon as Judas is gone forth: 'Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him.' He had fulfilled His work *in the Spirit*, in altogether vanquishing the spirit of Judas; and in an entirely free contest, without any impulse of legal constraint or force, had removed him from the company of His disciples, by the influence of a merely Gospel power. For thus He had maintained His life in its New Testament spirituality: even the treachery of a Judas had not prevailed to throw him back on the Old Testament ground of legal wrath; still less on to the pagan standings of vengeance, or of despondency, or of political expediency. And He had thus at once purged the body of His disciples from the coils of a serpent-like worldliness, of a devilishly polluted chiliasm, and from the deceptive and paralyzing ascendancy of an instrument of the powers of darkness. And thus, for the third time, substantially He had determined the redemption and purification of His Church from the hypocritical forms of dark powers, which had designed to break through into the inner and inmost circle of the Church's life. He had, moreover, cut off His Church from the demons of hell arrayed in light—from the corruptions of flatterers, from the projects of worldliness. He had delivered His institution for ever from the danger of corruption under such influences; and thus had vanquished on its behalf all those spirits of the abyss. But He attained the victory *at the price* of being betrayed by the false disciple, forsaken by the other disciples, rejected by His people, crucified by the world! For this destiny of death is decided in the moment of His victory over Judas. Therefore in the deepest meaning He is able to utter the word: Now is the Son of man glorified. He has accomplished the determination of His spiritual glory, of His spiritual victory over the world. Moreover, as He has approved Himself, not in isolated humanity, but as the God-man, thus God is glorified also in Him.

The power of God had constantly illustrated itself in His life. But the moment in which He overcame Judas was the climax of the spiritual revelation of God. In this moment God in human form was gloriously opposed to Satan, in the nature of a man filled with him; and drove him forth from the com-

pany of disciples. It was a *spiritual struggle:* Therefore it was so imperceptible, that the disciples did not at all understand what was then going forward; still less the people who were moving about outside in the streets. It was a *divine victory,* and therefore infinitely rich in results.

Jesus fully perceived how completely unappreciated this great event had been by His disciples. But to Him it was certain that the turning-point for this concealment of God's glory in Him had now arrived. 'If God be glorified in Him,' He continues, 'God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him.' Now, when God, veiled in the lowliness and misconception to which Christ had been subject, and in His perfectly completed spirit-struggle, has accomplished His highest work—now will follow also the time when Christ is glorified in Him, that thus the glory of Christ is made plain to the world in the government of God, and to the revelation of His highest glory.

Thus, moreover, Christ regards the victory of His Spirit over the spirit of Judas, gained with the deepest suffering, as the deepest spiritual foundation of His passion, and of His victory over the kingdom of darkness entirely. Here is decided the Spirit's passion and the Spirit's victory, as in Gethsemane the soul's passion of Jesus was accomplished, and the triumph of His soul decided. Thus in the spirit even already does Jesus welcome the dawning of His glory.[1]

And now His whole heart expresses itself to the disciples. 'Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek Me—that is, painfully seek and sorrowfully find Me wanting—and as I said to the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say unto you.' He thus refers to the great sorrows of the privation of His presence which fell upon His first disciples in their earthly pilgrimage after His ascension; and as these are appointed for all His disciples, the entire militant Church for the time to come, He now expresses this sympathy

[1] But still not as if these individual results were accomplished and experienced for their own sake. Christ undergoes all His sorrows in the completeness of His divine humanity. But the trial of sorrow which He has to endure is, first of all, especially a trial *of the Spirit,* and *spiritual;* then especially *soul-sorrow, psychical;* finally (in the cross), especially bodily torment, and *physical.*

with the orphaned ones, which He had often expressed before, in the deepest emotion of His soul.

With these feelings He instituted the holy communion, which was appointed to supply to His disciples, in conjunction with His word and Spirit, the deepest and most consolatory compensation for His absence till His return.

Doubtless John refers to this institution when he continues the words of Jesus, 'A new commandment I give unto you, in order that (ἵνα) ye may love one another;[1] *as I have loved you*, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.' This is the essential element of the Lord's Supper in the Johannic view. He assumes the rite of the Lord's Supper and the history of its institution to be known. To him the chief matter is, that the communion is acknowledged as the new law of love, as the legal designation of the new covenant. For, substantially, the communion is in effect the only New Testament law,—the essence and centre of all New Testament legality. Baptism is only the introduction to this new law of life; the Lord's-day and all other ecclesiastical ordinances are only the development and the surrounding of the same.

The most essential definition of the communion, however, is to hold together and to unite the disciples in love, through the representation and assurance of the love of Christ. They are to love one another, and to do so in the spirit of sacrifice in the heroic style, as the love of Christ is represented to them in the

[1] Probably the institution of the holy communion itself might be comprehended as the ἐντολὴ καινή, as the great institution of the new covenant, and the subsequent ἵνα consequently indicates in the strictest sense the object of the holy communion. The external similarity of the text, 1 John ii. 7, 8, where the law of love is indicated as that which in one relation is *new*, in the other is *old*, must not lead us to an identification of the two expressions. The distinction between the two passages appears indeed from the fact, that there the law of love is represented as at once new and old. The ἐντολὴ καινὴ thus indicates perhaps the same as διαθήκη καινή. Herewith is at the same time solved the difficulty (which otherwise has not yet been sufficiently removed) which arises if the expression is referred to the commandment of love itself,—the question, namely, how Jesus could speak of this ἐντολὴ as a new one, when the command of love of one's neighbour was already present in the Old Testament. Comp. Olshausen, iv. 51. On the omission of the narrative of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in John, compare Ebrard, 409.

celebration of His sacrificial death. And it was to be the token of recognition of the disciples of Christ—their Church communion appointed by Christ in its entire living truth, attested by the essential communion in love.

Christ appointed the holy communion, by giving to the breaking of bread at the partaking of the Passover, and the distribution of the cup of thanksgiving after it, a new significance. Thus, in this act, He caused the flower of New Testament reality to break forth from the bud of the Old Testament type, or the kernel of the New Testament symbol of reality to burst from the shell of Old Testament typical symbol. Thus, as in Christian baptism, the holy washing loosened itself from the element of circumcision with which, in the conception of the perfect Israelite consecration, it was united in one; as denoting the new birth, by the putting to death, and new enlivening power of the Spirit. Thus, in this appointment, the holy breaking of bread and the distribution of the cup disengaged itself from the celebration of the Passover with which it had been closely connected, as a symbol of the holy nourishment of the high life, by the partaking of the high nourishment of life of the thank-offering. Thus circumcision, as the *national substance* of the institution, fell away, whilst its *universal kernel*, the holy washing, developed itself to its full significance in holy baptism. Here henceforth the celebration of the Passover fell away, because it likewise represented the *national side* of the subject; on the other hand, the *universal kernel* developed itself—the sacred partaking of bread and wine at the holy communion. In the place of the *typical* circumcision appeared in the new covenant the *actual* circumcision, the new birth by the Spirit of Christ; therefore the old circumcision itself could not continue in the Christian Church, but only its universal image, the religious *washing*, as a sacrament, or as a symbolical representation and confirmation of new birth. In the place of the *typical* Passover, moreover, appeared the real Passover, in the faithful partaking of the fruit of the death of Jesus. Thus, there was needed here only the assurance of this partaking through that universal image of the Passover which was given in the breaking of unleavened bread in union with the cup of thanksgiving. Thus were type and symbol united together: the type, as the historical legal foresign of the fact not yet present, and fulfilled in the essence of the Spirit; the symbol, as an ever-

lasting counterpart, mirror, and seal of the eternally fulfilled fact represented in the phenomenal world. Here the reality comes in the place of the type; the symbol continues, but it obtains a new significance in appearing now in relation to the reality, established, fulfilled, and inspired, by the spirit of reality—a sacrament!

Thus, as the celebration of the Passover was referred back as a thank-offering to the completed sin-offering, so Jesus, in the appointment of the New Testament thank-offering, already presupposed the certainty of His sacrificial death, and the spiritual perception of the same. He represents His body as already broken, His blood as already shed; body and blood as already separated and transformed into the nourishment of the life of His disciples.[1]

In consistency with the Passover, and in the manner of that feast,[2] Jesus took the bread, the unleavened cake, said over it the thanksgiving, which at the same time was the blessing of the gift,[3] brake the bread, and shared it among the disciples. Instead of the Old Testament words of distribution,[4] however, He spoke entirely new ones: 'Take, eat; this is My body, which is given for you:[5] this do in remembrance of Me.'

And He took the cup, the third[6] ritually appointed cup, as it

[1] Thus it is false when the Catholic Church identifies the celebration of the Lord's Supper with the atoning sacrifice of Christ, just as when it conceives, in justification of withholding the cup, that it may say that the blood is nevertheless contained in the body. Nam panis et vinum respondeat causi et umguini a se invicem separatis et sic in hostia oblatis. Cocceius, Aphorismi, Disputatio, xxxi. § 7. [Bynæus quotes from Keuchenius: Nimirum in omnibus victimis duæ erant partes essentiales, *caro* et *sanguis*. Vocem autem בשר seu carnis LXX. interpretes quandoque per σῶμα exprimunt. Cf. Heb. xiii. 11.' His own conclusion is, that no one can doubt that Jesus meant here to signify 'Corpus suum exanime et mortuum, quale pependit in cruce.' The primary reason for the use of the word σῶμα, and not σάρξ, is, that the former is the *whole* which was offered on the cross: each part was σάρξ; but it was not a part, nor any number of parts, but the *whole*, which was the sacrifice, and which could be presented symbolically to the disciples.—Ed.]

[2] Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν.

[3] Praised be Thou, our God, Thou King of the world, who bringest forth bread out of the earth.—Friedlieb, 56.

[4] This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in Egypt.

[5] Διδόμενον. 1 Cor. xi. 24, κλώμενον.

[6] Μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι. The cup of blessing, כוס הברכה. [The ritual ob-

followed upon the meal, spake the words of consecration and thanksgiving[1] over it, and gave it to them, with the words, 'Drink ye all of it;' and they all drank of it (Mark xiv. 23). Then He spake again, 'This is My blood, the blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me' (1 Cor. xi. 25).

In this distribution of bread and wine we conceive of the Lord no longer as among the partakers.[2] He has previously before this celebration, at the partaking of the Passover, drunk with them for the last time of the cup, wherewith the Passover began. Consequently, in all probability, the words which the Evangelists Matthew and Mark place here belong to the place where Luke has written them.

The words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' are preserved[3] by the Apostle Paul as well as by the Evangelist Luke, doubtless upon the ground of a certain tradition. If, however, they were spoken for the first time at the distribution of the bread, as Luke records them, it probably belongs as certainly to the rhythm of the speech that they should be here spoken for the second time at the distribution of the wine, as we are to suppose according to Paul. The fact that Christ distributes to His

served among the Jews may be seen in Lightfoot's *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. xxvi. 26, or in Bynæus, *De Morte Christi*, i. viii. Lightfoot says of this cup, 'The cup certainly was the same with the "cup of blessing:" namely, when, according to the custom, after having eaten the farewell morsel of the lamb, there was now an end of supper, and thanks were to be given over the third cup after meat, He takes that cup.' etc. Bynæus does not express himself decidedly (p. 622), but inclines to the opinion that this was the fourth cup.—ED.]

[1] Praised be Thou, Lord our God, Thou King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine.

[2] In this Olshausen finds a reason against the personal communication of the clergy. It is, perhaps, not altogether evangelical to assume that the clergyman, at the distribution of the Lord's Supper, stands in the place of Christ as opposed to the people. But only by considering him as a member of the congregation, and the congregation as itself priests, is the difficulty of the actual communication of the officiating clergyman to be set aside.

[3] The Apostle Paul illustrates the words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' by adding, 'In so often as ye do eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come.'

disciples His body and His blood in the bread and wine while He is still living, proves that here there can be no reference to a corporeal change of substance in His body and His blood. Could it be supposed that here a new Christ, and, indeed, a dead Christ, was created by the side of the living one? From the same fact, it follows that here there cannot be present the body and the blood of Christ in the bread and wine in the sense of a substantial presence. For in this manner Christ would already have been present as the crucified One, in the elements of the communion, whilst He stood before His disciples as the still uncrucified One—as the still living One.

It is thus plain that Christ, in speaking the words, while yet alive, which refer to His body and to His blood, intends to represent His body and His blood to the disciples in picturesque signs. That is, in other words, the bread and the wine which previously were not yet His body and His blood, become now consecrated to signify His body and His blood—to signify,[1] and indeed not in an allegorical, but in a symbolical sense.

But here, when the disciples of Christ partook of the Lord's Supper from His own hand, with the word of His mouth, under His eyes, it is entirely plain that they were fed not only with signs of remembrance on *the historical* Christ, but with the Spirit and life of the *eternally living* Christ.[2]

But to them it is not only their partaking that makes His presence, but, moreover, His presence makes to them their partaking. He not only communicates to them His word, but also His living breath; not only His spiritual power, but also His manifestation of life in the Supper, which thus forms, together with His whole presence, a living unity. They partake of Himself, in His real life, in the bread and wine.[3]

Nay, as this communion is appointed to aspire entirely to the sacred purpose of uniting the partakers wholly with Christ, so it is appointed to change itself in them, *according to His working*, wholly into the body and the blood of Christ.[4]

[1] This is the Zwinglian characteristic,—the relation of the Lord's Supper to the history of the death of Jesus, absolutely indispensable, if the doctrine of the holy communion is not to run into superstition,—but only the foundation indeed for the subsequent characteristics.

[2] This is the Calvinistic characteristic.

[3] This is the Lutheran characteristic.

[4] This is the old Catholic characteristic, which is totally distinct, plainly,

In other words, they partake, first of all, of the historical, the crucified Christ, and certainly in sign and seal. Next, they partake of the spiritual Christ, as the eternally living One, constantly present in the Spirit. They partake of Him, moreover, as the glorified One, whose entire power of life is communicated to His word and to His institution. Finally, they partake of Him as the ideal-universal, who draws up heaven and earth into the life of His life, who changes the whole new humanity into His body; and even the world of creatures, whose symbol here is bread and wine, He transforms into an organ of His life-giving life.

It is now perhaps proved, that this partaking in this consecration can never be a matter of indifference, so as that the receivers should only receive in the communion mere bread and wine. In every case they are placed in contact with the body and blood of Christ; either so, that its power fills them as believers, or drives them and terrifies them further away as unbelievers; the unrepentant and the hypocrites eat and drink to themselves condemnation.[1] Thus, as to the faithful, the communion is an anticipation of the feast of the kingdom; to the unbelieving it is an anticipation of condemnation.

To the faithful, the communion is to restore the visible fellowship of Christ, as the special New Testament ordinance, as the innermost centre of the Church—the peculiar point of sight of the pure visibility and the visible purity of the Church. The communicants are to show forth the Lord's death till He come again. Thus, the communion is the means of the perfect fellowship with the Lord, and indeed, first of all, of the fellowship of His death; secondly, of the fellowship of His life; thirdly, of the fellowship of His kingdom. Every one of these three characteristics embraces two blessings; the six blessings, moreover, which flow therefrom, combine in the unity of one *seventh*.

The communion is, first of all, the fellowship of the death of Jesus. It is related to the perfected sin-offering in His death.

from the doctrine of transubstantiation: for, first of all, here the change does not transpire in the hand of the priest, and by its means, but in the partaker himself; secondly, it is not a change into the material, but into the Christian ideal.

[1] Thus, perhaps, is arranged the difference which arose between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, on the question whether unbelievers as well as believers receive in the communion the body and the blood of Christ.

The communicants enter into the fellowship of the body and the blood of Christ.[1] They die with Him to sin, and to the world; share with Him in the judgment in His spirit; devote their old life in the power of His death—to death. But whilst they receive the sublimely pure blessing of the consecration to death, they obtain also, at the same time, the fruit of His death —reconciliation. It is assured to them, that His body broken, His blood shed, has become a remission *for them.* This is thus the first double blessing: the perfecting of repentance in the consecration of death; the perfecting of faith in the reconciliation with God by the celebration of the self-sacrifice of Christ.

But this first characteristic, the celebration of the fellowship of the death of Christ, forms in the holy communion the introduction to the second—to the celebration of the fellowship of His life. In respect of this relation of the two characteristics, there is in this relation a definite contrast, not to be denied, between holy baptism and holy communion. In the former, the celebration of death, the representation and assurance of dying with Christ, is the eventual characteristic; the celebration of the new life, on the other hand, appears as the conclusion of this consecration of death: it is rather hinted at than developed; it appears as the tender delicate bud of the mystic *passion-flower* which is represented in baptism. In the celebration of the holy communion, on the other hand, the death of Christ is represented as a fact already completed, and a foundation for the attaining of the new life. Moreover, the consecration to death of the communicant is here already supposed. It has, for instance, begun in baptism; it has been repeated and deepened in the preparation and absolution which precede the communion (points which at the institution of the communion were symbolized by the foot-washing); and in the communion itself it is still only completed and assured. Thus far the Lord's Supper is rather a celebration of the renewed joyfulness of death, than of the first consecration to death of the faithful. But how can the festival of the fellowship of Christ's death be changed into the festival of the fellowship of His life? This change is a consequence of the fact, that His death itself, as the highest fact of His life,—a free surrender to the judgment of God on the sins of the world,—has also become the highest attainment of life—re-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 16.

surrection; that the sin-offering has been entirely changed in the fire of divine government into a thank- and peace-offering for the world, because it was altogether made a sin-offering by the priestly authorities of the world, and was yet wholly without sin, because in Him there was nothing to destroy, to judge, or to put to death, but the historical connection with the ancient Israel, with the ancient world. Thus Christ became a thank-offering, a holy partaking of life and bread of life, for those who with Him have died to the old world. They partake in the holy communion the fellowship of His life, and indeed this again in twofold blessing. The first is the entire perception with what power of sacrifice Christ has loved them, and eternally loves them; the second is, that they are united to one another in this love. John has put forward these two blessings as those which form the peculiar centre of the festival as the effluence of the fellowship of the love of Christ.

With the celebration of the fellowship of the new love of Christ, moreover, there is, thirdly, established the celebration of the fellowship of His kingdom. The Lord's Supper is the anticipatory celebration of the future glory of the kingdom of believers, and so far is itself a type of the future actual feast of the kingdom to which Christ has pointed the disciples.[1] It represents prefiguratively the future manifestation of the Church of the kingdom; the glorification of their partaking in divine blessedness; the inheritance of the world in the Spirit of glory; the consecration of its elements to the body and blood of Christ, embracing and glorifying the new humanity. But the two blessings which this characteristic embraces, are, first of all, the renewal of the pilgrim-feeling and the pilgrim-disposition in the midst of the privations and sorrows of time, which continue for the Church even to the return of Christ, the vivid representation that a special Lord's Supper may be held in the times of the

[1] The Lord's Supper is a symbol as celebration of the fellowship of the death of Christ,—a sacrament as celebration of the fellowship of His life,—a type as celebration of the fellowship of His kingdom: as a symbol, it refers to the sacrifice of the death of Christ; as a type, it points to the future blessedness of the Church of His kingdom; as a sacrament, it sets forth the partaking in the life of Christ in the power of representation and assurance. But as this centre of the celebration commands and embraces all the characteristics of it, both the typical and the symbolical side have a sacramental character.

world's evening, in expectation of the advent of the Lord. Secondly, the anticipation of the heavenly feast of the kingdom, or the perfect experience of the everlasting presence of Christ. But all these blessings are included in the seventh. The Lord's Supper is a celebration of the everlasting life which Christians find in commemorating, as a confirmation of the faith, their becoming one with the Three in One, or in keeping the actual communion with the Father and with the Son in the Holy Ghost (John xiv. 23; Rev. iii. 20).

Although we cannot but recognise a great proof of human weakness in the fact, that the disciples could forsake the Lord on the same night that they had received the sacred symbols from the Lord's hands, yet we must not forget to ask ourselves, what would have become of them if, in that terrible hour of temptation, He had not communicated to them His blessing? Yea, what would have become of His Church, if He had not united it by this wonderful bond of fellowship indissolubly with His heart? It is indeed certain, not only that Christ delivered the Church by His death and victory, and converted it by His word and by His Spirit, but *completed* and *confirmed* it by this institution.

That He appointed the Lord's Supper with the anticipation of the great temptation which the disciples had to undergo, He announced, immediately after its celebration, in the significant and admonitory words wherewith He prepared Peter for what was coming:

'Simon, Simon (not Peter, Peter), behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for *thee*, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.'

Satan *desires* to have men separate from God; Christ *prays for them*. The kingdom of the evil one thinks to have a claim to sinners, when they have at all meddled with it. It fancies itself invincible with its pleasures, and perfectly irresistible with its terrors; and all evil ones fancy that those who have escaped from the net of their pleasures, are still holden by the magic of their terrors. Above all things, the prince of evil thinks this; and because even the apparently pious, the priests, even the disciples of Jesus, are not approved as holy,—because even in them is sin, or even only because they are men in whom, as such, sin appears to exist,—thus he searches, even in them, for what is his

own; he wishes to draw it *and them* forcibly to himself. For all evil hangs together; every evil attracts every other evil; and this powerful attraction of hell is individualized; it has its organ, it has its animating centre.

Thus the evil one desires to winnow all men, because as sinners they actually have evil in them, or because as men they wear in themselves the appearance of sinners. He makes claim to them according to the right of consistency—of consequence.

In this apparently rightful claim of the kingdom of darkness, there really is, moreover, a true characteristic of equity. Man cannot, for instance, come to the righteousness of the new world until he is free from the lust and from the terror of the old world. Hell could not slay him as its prey with the arrow of lust or of fear, if he already stood upon heavenly ground. He must thus pass through the refining fire of the terrors of hell, if he is to be approved for heaven. He is not in his spirit master of his life, until he has undergone not only the pleasure, but also the suffering, of life.

And yet the rightful claim of the evil one on men is converted in his sense to injustice. The evil one desires that the sinner should remain a sinner, according to the law of consequence. The pretence of consequentiality, however, here becomes the most abstract and deadest right, and thus the deepest wrong.[1] But it could not become wrong if there were not, *à priori*, a fallacy contained in it. This fallacy is the false assumption, that the sinner has been seeking *sin* itself *in sin*. But the case is altogether different. Even in sin he seeks the well-being of his soul, although he misses it *by his evil delusion*. But if he is freed from his delusion, he must seek the life of his soul according to the claim of consequence in an altogether opposite direction, and thus set at defiance all the lust and all the fear of hell. And just for that reason that he thus proves himself, he must show that the claim of darkness and of Satan on his soul is a falsehood and an illusion. Then he must be sifted by the terrors of hell after he has renounced the attractions of hell. The sifting cannot be spared him; but, by the grace of God, by the intercession of Christ, it is to redound to his salvation. Precisely for that reason, God allows the kingdom of the evil one to have power, gives it room to sift His people as wheat

[1] Summum jus, summa injuria.

under His supreme dominion, in order to bring to nothing the power of the evil one.

In this spirit of glorification of the divine government, Christ speaks of the desire of Satan. It is Satan's care, by the operation of his magical winnow, to make all wheat (which he regards as only seeming wheat) to appear as chaff. The Lord's care is therefore to separate the wheat from the chaff.

The Baptist had said of Christ, 'Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly cleanse His floor.' Since here Christ declares of Satan, that He would sift his wheat, He thus declares that He is ruling over him, that He will make him serviceable to Himself, that He will bring to nothing his design, and turn his attacks to the best account.

But what does He oppose to the evil one's bold assertion of right in the presence of God? Pious prayer! Satan appeals violently to right, and uses actual force against the pious; Christ, on the other hand, turns prayerfully to grace. He knows that the claim can do nothing against love; that right becomes false, and the deepest wrong, if it is to be serviceable to hatred; moreover, that love, in its desire to deliver by intercession, is one with the grace and righteousness of God, the source out of whom right proceeds. He knows that in God righteousness is one with grace, not in opposition to it, but operative for its kingdom; that thus before God the pious prayer of compassion has right against the daring claim of the accuser of men; that, finally, even the gentle, peaceable, powers of intercession have greater influence upon the hearts of the wavering disciples in their temptation, than the dazzling and terrible powers of the kingdom of darkness. Thus He prayed for Peter.

He plainly foresees with certainty, that the faith of the disciple will waver, because there is still much unholiness in him which belongs to the world; but it is also certain to Him that he will not utterly fail,—that a spark of faith is to remain alive in him.

He points out both to him. Yea, He explains, at the same time, that he should come forth from his fall with a rich power of grace, in that He gives him the command, 'When thou art converted, *strengthen* thy brethren.' It is thus at once intimated that all his brethren should also waver in the temptation. But *he* is to return from his deeper fall with the richer experience of grace, which they should then need for their

strengthening. This prediction of the Lord was perfectly fulfilled after the resurrection. Peter had in the greatest degree undergone the terror of the world and of hell, and experienced the delivering hand of grace; thence the courage which strengthened his brethren. With this divine security and truth the master-glance of the Lord controlled the way of His disciples, even in those hours when His own soul was most deeply afflicted.

Peter, moreover, could not yet comprehend the whole import of this word. That Jesus had kept with them in the Lord's Supper the precursory celebration of His death—this was clear to him. But this had rather developed in him the heroic desire to die with Him, than the understanding of His going to death. He believed that Jesus would now separate from their midst, in order to undergo apart from them a great contest. 'Lord, whither goest thou?' asked he Him. Jesus answered him, 'Whither I go, thou canst not follow Me now; but thou shalt follow Me hereafter,'—a reference to His departure by a martyr's death. 'Lord, why cannot I follow Thee now?' answered the disciple; 'I will lay down my life for Thy sake.' 'I am ready,' said he, according to Luke, 'to go with Thee both to prison and to death.' At this word of presumptuous self-sufficiency he must hear the terribly solemn announcement, 'Wilt thou lay down thy life for My sake? Verily, verily, I say unto you, That this day, yea, even in this night, the cock shall not crow twice before thou shalt have denied Me thrice.'

After this severe word of terror, in which the disciple might fancy he saw an accusation as yet unintelligible to him, it was now the part of the Lord to discover to him the most peculiar reason of his weakness and enervation, and of his sudden fall. He knew that Simon had already thought of the means of resistance and self-help; that he would lose his courage of witness-bearing, because he had a desire to tread the way of earthly strength. He wished now to bring this circumstance to light. He asks the disciples, 'When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye anything?' They answered, 'Nothing.' These were the fair days, when they moved among the enthusiastic welcomes of His people. His name was everywhere sufficient recommendation to them. But now other days have come. They must now prepare themselves for the enmity of the world. They must be ready for a great abandonment

and a great struggle. Thus He continues: 'But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip, if he has one.' As if He should say, The matter is now a thorough emigration out of the old world. Then He adds, 'He that is not yet provided with a sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.'

Here it becomes entirely clear that He recommended to them the highest result of spiritual preparation—a preparation for need and death. It is almost superfluous to observe, that the swords can only be understood figuratively; for at that late evening hour nobody could think of buying a sword in an actual sense.

Moreover, it is equally plain for what reason Jesus has chosen the expression 'sword' to recommend to them spiritual preparation. With the same view, to bring them to the discovery and exhibition of their means of strength, He goes on: 'For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in Me, He was reckoned among the transgressors,' the lawless, the law-breakers, the seditious. This had been prophesied of the great reconciling Sufferer of the theocracy (Isa. liii.). He adds, 'For the things concerning Me (in Scripture) have an end.' The finger of Scripture points to the end. He knows that His end is near. Moreover, He sees His end sketched in the prophecies of Scripture; hence this passage also, that He should be counted as a transgressor among the transgressors. It is thus certain to Him that this doom is impending closely. Just for this reason He says, Make the greatest preparation.

The disciples have followed the external sound of His words, but not their spirit. They think that He is referring to the speedy coming of the necessity of armed resistance to the enemy, and cry out, apparently, with confidence and triumph, as being armed, 'Behold, Lord, here are swords—two!'

'*It is enough*,' said the Lord, doubtless with the most painful expression, and with the smile of holy sorrow. *Enough—more than enough.* The manner in which He said it must have told the disciples how painfully their blindness grieved Him. Two swords to defend twelve persons—to defend them against the power of the Jewish magistracy, and against the legions of the Roman empire; yea, to defend them against the spirits of evil and against all the powers of darkness! Two swords for this war!

'Yea, it is enough,' said He. As if He would have said: Enough to make manifest your want of understanding; to explain

your approaching fall; and to suggest to My enemies the suspicion that My cause is one with that of the malefactors.

That Jesus did not want the two swords literally, is plain from the requirement that He had given them, that every disciple was to have his own sword, even although he should sell his garment for it; and, possibly, He had led the discourse to this point, with the view that the swords might be brought forward; because He wished to manifest the weakness by which Peter was soon to fall.

But even then the disciples did not sufficiently understand the heavy sigh of Jesus: as is plain from the subsequent incident in Gethsemane—the fact that there Peter struck with the sword.

But by an exegetic fatality of world-wide significance, the Romish theology upon these two swords founds the theory of the spiritual and the secular sword, of which the one is the attribute of the Pope, the other of the Emperor; but still in such a manner that the latter is mediately at the disposal of the Pope.

It is enough: a sigh of the God-man, who thus breathes forth a lament over Romish swords and martyr-piles; over the wars of the Paulicians and Hussites; over all the physical forces of the New Testament era, whereby men seek to further His cause. All these applications of physical force are enough to show that the true Christian spirit is still wanting to such combatants, and that to the false efforts of carnal bravery will succeed the denials of carnal faint-heartedness.

The celebration was now concluded, by singing at its close the usual song of praise (Ps. cxv.–cxviii.). At that time probably the fourth cup was not drunk; still less a fifth; which was sometimes drunk when the feast was prolonged during the singing of other psalms (cxx.–cxxxvii.). The partaking of the last cup pointed, perhaps, from the first to the kingdom of glory. At least, even at the beginning of the supper, the Lord seems to announce to His disciples that the festival should be fulfilled in His kingdom. It is scarcely needful to point out that what is meant here is a celebration in a higher sense—an element of the heavenly life; but certainly also a real celebration, in the most literal, and in the highest sense.

According to the three first Evangelists, Christ, after the song of praise, went out with His disciples to the Mount of Olives. The two first relate, that on the way He declared to

them, that in that same night, which had then some time begun, all of them would be offended at Him. The Evangelist John records the solemn parting discourses which Christ uttered to His disciples in connection with His intercession for them, as occurring in the interval between the close of the Passover and the arrival at Gethsemane. The question here is, How are we to conceive of the local circumstances under which Jesus spoke the larger discourses, and how are they related to the account of the three first-Evangelists?

It is first to be considered here, that the words which, according to the two first Evangelists, Jesus spoke to the disciples on the way to the Mount of Olives, bear a considerable resemblance to the words which John (xvi. 32) attributes to Him, announcing to them that the hour was come when they should be scattered from Him. Moreover, it is to be noted that even John misplaces this address to the disciples on the way to the Mount of Olives, when He relates this departure in chap. xiv. 31, but does not allow the crossing over the Kedron to follow, till the moment indicated in chap. xviii. 1. Thus, what in John, chap. xiv., Jesus at first said to the disciples, was said in the moment of departure. This is indicated by all the considerations which underlie this discourse. The departure and the going forth into a great peril form the foreground of the representation. The question of the *whither*, and of the *way*, is the fundamental thought. The consideration of the night is markedly prominent, very probably also that of the starry heaven. Above all, we should thus have to distinguish one special discourse which Jesus addressed to His disciples at His departure to the Mount of Olives, from the more lengthy conversations.[1]

[1] [The fact that Matthew and Mark seem to place our Lord's prediction of Peter's fall after they left the supper-room, while John very distinctly places it before, has caused some difficulty in the arrangement of this part of the narrative. Alford thinks the prediction in John is distinct from that in Matthew; and certainly there is nothing improbable in the supposition that Peter should, on the way to Gethsemane, renew his protestations of fidelity. Augustine (followed by Greswell) holds a threefold prediction: 'Ter eum expressisse præsumptionem suam diversis locis sermonis Christi, et ter illi a Domino responsum quod eum esset ante galli cantum ter negaturus' (*De Consens. Evan.* iii. 2). Riggenbach (623) thinks there was but one prediction, which Matthew and Mark insert somewhat later than it actually took place. On the use of τότε in Matthew, as an indication of time, see Riggenbach, p. 424.—Ed.]

The following discourse (chaps. xv. and xvi.) cannot thus have been spoken on the same occasion.[1] Not only is the fundamental thought of it a new one, but it intimates also a new mode of consideration. The image of the vine, of the vine just pruned and purged, whose branches will now soon bring forth fruit; and the contrast of those unfruitful branches cut off and withered, which are to be cast into the fire: this is plainly the starting-point of the discourse. Let the reader now picture to himself the way which leads to the Mount of Olives, by Gethsemane, out of the city of Jerusalem. It passes by gardens in the valley,[2] in which doubtless are vines.[3] Moreover, it is probably in harmony with the season, if we suppose that these had been pruned[4] a short time before, and that the branches cut off had already withered. And perhaps here and there are still some garden-fires burning low, which might have been lighted on the eve of the festival.[5] As, in consistency, we are now to look for the Lord, as He utters this discourse, between the city of Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives, we cannot but think that on the way, in the neighbourhood of gardens, He is induced, by special considerations which occurred to Him (to which per-

[1] As, for example, Tholuck supposes, p. 343. I have already suggested this view in my first vol., p. 274. [' That the discourse in chaps. xv. and xvi., with the prayer in chap. xvii., was spoken in the supper-room, appears very clearly from chap. xviii. 1, where it is said, "When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron," which can scarcely refer to a departure from any other place, although referred by some to His going out of the city. It appears also from this, that after His words, "Arise, let us go hence," no change of place is mentioned till the prayer is ended, and from the improbability that such a discourse would be spoken by the way. We conclude, therefore, that the Lord, after the disciples had arisen, and while still standing in the room, continued His discourse, and ended it with the prayer.' Andrews, p. 411. And so Meyer, Stier, Alford, and Ellicott.—ED.]

[2] The garden of Gethsemane is even still surrounded by other enclosures. See Robinson, i. 234. Compare Tischendorf, '*Reise in den Orient*,' i. 313.

[3] On the burning up of the vine-cutting, compare Ezek. xv. 6.

[4] That the vine was cultivated at Jerusalem, appears very clearly from 2 Kings xviii. 31; compare Zech. iii. 10; Micah iv. 4. Of the existing Jerusalem, Robinson relates, 'Neither vines nor fig-trees *thrive on the high ground* round the city, although the latter are found in the gardens beyond Siloam.'

[5] It appears from Exod. xxii. 6, that in Palestine, about the time of the beginning of harvest, frequent garden or field fires were burning.

haps chap. xvi. 25 refers), to make a characteristic pause, in order to point out to the disciples the glimpse of the fair Whitsuntide, when they ought to bear the ripe fruits of His life in the fellowship of His Spirit; in order, moreover, at the same time, to make them acquainted with the severe trial and jeopardy of soul which even now awaits them—the risk of being cut off and cast away as useless branches from Him. This He does now, at this point, in His second larger farewell discourse.

It is not probable that He uttered the solemn intercessory prayer (John xvii.) during a third pause, at a third and different point. The connection between John xvi. 33 and xvii. 1 appears at least to suggest the contrary. Moreover, from the passage xvii. 26, the conclusion may be gathered, that Jesus delivered the high-priestly prayer immediately before His final going over the brook Kedron. Thus, it may be supposed that He was already at the foot of the acclivity beyond the city, when He spoke the parabolic discourse of the purged vine, and of the burning branches (a reference to Judas, who was already cut off from Him, and a warning to them, who were in danger of allowing themselves to separate from Him). For just here the vineyards must have come under His view in the plainest manner; and if perchance here and there a garden-fire was burning, it was here most distinctly visible. And then Jesus turned to Kedron. The crossing over it was the last decisive act of His going to death; at the same time, it was the advance of His disciples into the deepest peril of soul: therefore He committed them previously in faithful intercession to His Father.

We have constantly seen before how much the statements of the Evangelist John everywhere depend upon the most decidedly concrete views of a history connectedly progressing. This is the case here. Through the more ideal estimate of the Johannic farewell discourses of Jesus, are sharply seen, with the most marked and lively features, their historical motives and impulses.

Jesus thus spoke the first farewell word to His disciples on leaving the room. They went forth into the night,[1] and felt

[1] [Our Lord probably set out for the Mount of Olives about eleven o'clock. Some make it earlier. Greswell says (*Dissert.* iii. 192): 'The period of the year was the vernal equinox, and the day of the month about two days before the full moon, in which case the moon would be now not very far past her

conscious that they were going forth into a peril of death, still concealed, but terrible. Whither they went, they themselves knew not. But the Lord saw clearly in the Spirit, that they from henceforward would be strangers and foreigners upon earth, in a totally different sense from that in which they had hitherto been so. His homeless, His hearthless followers! that the security and glory of life in the old home of this world was now passing away for them. And so also for His people in all future times. In this sympathy He consoles them, as the representatives of His Church, by pointing them to the inheritance in heaven, and to His everlasting life in this inheritance for them.

And this is just the fundamental thought of the first address. They were to know that He knows of a heaven for them, for them,—is going into that heaven, ministers in heaven,—returns from heaven!

'Let not your heart be troubled' (Do not lose composure!), He cries to them. They must take courage for the bold step of faith which greets the old *Here* as a stranger, the new *Hereafter* as the home. 'Believe in God,' He continues, 'believe also in Me.' From the simplest but the deepest faith in God, is to issue the faith in the truth of His progress of life, through the death of the cross to the glory of the new life. There is a new home, says He to them there, in the words, 'In My Father's house are many mansions.' His Father's house is the universe: thus, perhaps, the many mansions appear to them in the glittering lights of the starry heaven. If we picture to ourselves that at this moment Jesus is about to step forth with His disciples under the starry canopy, we can hardly conceive but that He must with these words have pointed upwards to those testimonies of the heavenly habitations. And they were now to know, that there are many dwellings there in a new life for Him and for them,—to receive Him when He parts from them; to receive them when they follow Him, through the misery of the cross, and the martyr's death—when they are driven forth from the old earth. At the same time is declared the certainty of their personal immortality—of their continuance in the other world—of their new

meridian, and the night would be enlightened until a late hour towards the morning.' Of course the possibility of clouds must be taken into account.—Ed.]

life with the Lord in the Father's house. All this they were now certainly to know.

'If it were not so, would I tell you that I go to prepare a place for you?'[1]

This word of Jesus is plain. With the fullest conviction He declares before His disciples—before His Church—before the future of humanity—that He knows what He is saying when He affirms, I go to prepare a place for you. Thus, were there no future existence, no hereafter, no inheritance above for His people, then He expressly declares that He could not give His disciples a promise of this kind. He has therein most solemnly guarded against the assertions of those who pretend that in this place, as in similar ones, He has only veiled more general religious ideas already existing in the conceptions of the people, or that He has uttered promises in unconscious religiousness of the same kind. We are sure of it, His consciousness on this subject is thoroughly awake, and thoroughly defined. He stakes His own credibility on this promise; or rather, He gives His promise as a pledge that there is such an inheritance for them. It is as if He had spoken thus definitely, with a distinct foresight of the most remote times. But even His disciples needed this assurance.

Therefore He assures them, 'I go to prepare a place for

[1] My earlier interpretation of this passage, in the treatise, '*Das Land der Herrlichkeit*,' p. 87, incurs the twofold objection—1. That Jesus wishes actually to say to His disciples that He is going to prepare a place for them. 2. That, according to Christologic principles, the operation of Christ must not be so conceived as if He would of Himself provide habitations in the event of the Father omitting to do so. My present view is adopted by Lücke, p. 592, who remarks, that the expression εἶπον ἄν might be thus taken—an dicerem vobis, quod jam dicturus sum? Lücke, indeed, observes, that it is not to be supposed that Jesus would introduce a new suggestion of consolation (πορεύομαι) in this form. But a similar form occurs at other times in the life of Jesus; for example, at the healing of the man sick of the palsy, Matt. ix. 6. The ὅτι before πορεύομαι, which in this case is necessary, is actually found in the reading adopted by Lachmann. Certainly the construction, 'If it were not so, I would tell you,' would give no feeble meaning. Rather a very forcible one, since it must be supposed that Christ therein had in view the contradictions that would arise in the succeeding age to the doctrine of the future life, and the immortality of the individual. But it involves the difficulty of supposing that He had thought it necessary to instruct His disciples as to the conditions of hopelessness. Perhaps as with a like view (speaking ironically), Jean Paul constructed against atheism, 'A discourse of the dead Christ that there is no God.'

you.' And then He adds, 'And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will *come again*, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.' They are to regard His departure from them in this light. There is a pure paradisaical sphere in the house of the Father, which is appointed as a habitation for them. He will make this place their home; by His presence He will fill it with Christ-like life—Christianize it. Thus He will thereabove labour only for them. And as He prepares the place for them, He will also prepare them for the place. He will constantly come back to them by His Spirit, and fill them with the life of heaven—come again to individuals in the hour of death—come again to the collective Church at the end of the world, when at His appearing the great barrier between time and eternity shall fall down. What they must now grasp and maintain in faith is, that He will wholly live for them when He is parted from them—that He will live to them as if they could see Him. For this is just the Christian mode of viewing the world. Christ lives for His people in heaven, as the security and founder of an everlasting inheritance in the new world. But He knows full well, that in the hearts of His disciples, as in the dispositions of sinful humanity everywhere, many objections arise against this bold way of regarding things by Christian faith. These objections He desires to remove, and He effectually removes them in calling forth their expression by apparently paradoxical statement.

Thomas proposes the first difficulty, Philip the second, Judas Lebbæus the third. Each one opposes to Him exactly the scruple that had been most easily matured in the peculiarity of his own nature, in which He might thus actually become a representative of the band of disciples and of the world.

The first expression He calls forth with the word, 'And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.'

It is too much for Thomas, to whom, generally, the way of hope melts away so easily before the gaze of his doubting disposition. He answers plainly, 'Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way?' He concludes, because we know not the end, we cannot therefore know the way.

But Jesus inverts the matter. 'Ye do know the way, consequently ye must know the destination also. This inversion

is fully justified by the nature of the case. In external life, the way has no other importance than that which arises from the fact of its leading to the destination. But in the divine life the way is itself a revelation of the end—one with the end; thus, whoever in this case knows the way, substantially knows the end also.

Thus, he who knows not of the future, knows not of it for the reason that he knows not of *the heart* of the present. He who cannot grasp the consciousness of the future existence of the soul, has no substantial experience of the temporal energies of the soul in its essence. (He knows the royal monad only as he knows the monads of worms.) In proportion as he misconceives the heaven of Christ in the high places of the world, just as much, not more, but also not less, he misconceives the heaven in the depths of the life of Christ. For with the peculiarity of *the life* is assumed the peculiarity of *his way*, and with this the peculiarity of *his end*. He who thus knows Christ in the glory of His inner life, knows also in substance of the condition and of the kingdom of His glory, and knows that the way by which he attains to that end is none other than his own life in its perfected development.

With this meaning Christ says, 'I am the way;' and, by way of explanation, adds, 'as well the truth as the life;' thus, as well the perfect clearness of the way, as the perfect power of movement in this way. And, indeed, the one and the other, as well for Himself as for His people. For them He is the truth, which leads them surely to life—the life which keeps them faithfully from perishing on the way. But because He is the true way, He is the way to the Father; for this is the only way for the child of man—*the way absolutely*. And because He is this way in truth, He is also the *only* way. 'No man,' says He, 'cometh to the Father but through Me.' And because they thus know Him, the way, they must also in Him know the end, the Father in the Father's house, to which He is preceding them: 'If ye had known Me,' says He, 'ye should have known My Father also.'

And immediately He calls forth a new scruple, by making use of the strong enigmatical expression, 'And from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him.'

Philip, a disciple, who was in the habit of making much of visible evidences, now broke in with the remark, 'Lord, show

us the Father, and it sufficeth us.' This word of Jesus had thus found the strongest opposition in his peculiar disposition. This much is plain, that he conceives of still greater testimonies, still more manifest revelations of the Father, than are given to him in Christ. His look is still not sufficiently devoted and spiritual, to see in the manifestation of the life of Jesus, as conditioned by humanity, the unconditioned Father (conditioning Himself nevertheless in the Son)—to see in the historical lowliness of the Son the everlasting majesty of the Father. He seeks for phenomena of the Godhead beside *Jesus*, which should still more fully accredit as well Himself as His promise that He would prepare a place for them with the Father in the Father's house. He has thus not sufficiently recognised the grand original revelation of God, which gives them perfect security for the future life.

The Lord makes known to him His amazement that he is still so much involved in old prejudices. 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father.'

He who hath really known Him by the vision of the Spirit, must have known the Father; not indeed as the Father Himself, but as the very image of the Father—as the perfect revelation of the Father.

But He Himself interprets the deeply significant word with the question, 'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me?'

Christ is in the Father. He lives, speaks, and acts continually in the consciousness of perfect union with Him, as conceived, appointed, loved, and decreed by Him, going forth out of the depth of His nature and will, and continually absorbed in the same depth again, and Himself comprehending and determining Himself in it, infinitely conditioned in the Father, and always with freedom consenting to this conditionality, as though He constantly disappeared in the Father.

Reciprocally the Father is in Him—speaks and acts through Him as through the life-principle of humanity, and of the world and Himself; reveals Himself as the unconditioned Lord of all things. Christ makes known the agency of the Father, as if the Father were visible in Him.

He who sees Christ sees again always the Son in the Father, and the Father in the Son, for He beholds everlasting love in its manifestation,—in the lowliness of the form of a servant,—in the majesty of heaven; Himself prophetically revealing Himself; Himself in priestly character offering Himself for the world; and therein Himself declaring Himself with royal and victorious power.

He gives the proof of this. 'The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of Myself (from any arbitrary or egoistic principle): but the Father, that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works.' *Christ's words* are all interchangeably *the Father's works*, manifestations of His divine energy. Thus in all His words the Father Himself is operative; that is proved by the fact, that every word is a thunder and lightning of everlasting power, or rather a light-beam of everlasting love. Thus He may reasonably ask, 'Believe Me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me.'

Then He adds very significantly, 'or else believe Me for the very *works'* sake;' that is, for the works' sake, so far as these could be considered abstractly and separately, as undeniable miracles proceeding from Christ, and thus testifying of Him, in contrast with the loftier view which regards these miracles,—His words as the expressions and effusions of His innermost life, single beams which find their explanation in the nature of His glory.

Christ Himself has thus closely distinguished between the stand-point of faith in Him for the sake of the works,[1] *as the works*, and the stand-point of faith in Him for the sake of His words, *as divine words proceeding from the Spirit of the Father.* He has characterized the former as the subordinate standing. But He has recognised it as a provisional one for a necessity; nay, for the case of necessity He has required it. But He has appointed to it the life discipline of striving after the higher point, and of attaining to it.

This appears from the following assurance: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me, the works that I do (as far as these are concerned) shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do.'

[1] As it appears again in the apologetic stand-point of the more abstract supernaturalism.

Still greater than these, certainly not in respect of the power of operation, and of the wondrous form of their manifestation, but possibly in respect of the spiritual progress and the historical sphere of action; thus, greater inasmuch as Christ Himself is always performing, through His people, more glorious, deeper, more developed and more comprehensive works.

That He thus intended the word, is plain from what follows: 'Because I go to the Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, *that will I do*, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.' He repeats the word with emphasis, but so that at the same time the condition, *in My name*, is more markedly prominent: 'If ye shall ask anything *in My name*, I will do it.'

That they shall thus do greater works than those which He had hitherto done, appears from a sorites of the essential relations of faith in the following manner:—Christ goes to the Father, to the source of power. He goes from the position of the infinite conditionality of the Son, which He had as the centre of all the conditionality of the world, over into the consummation of His life, in His self-conditioning, or in His union with the Father; thus in sympathy with the unconditionality of the Father, outwardly represented by the entirely supra-mundane stand-point which henceforth He occupies. He becomes one with the Father in the carrying out of His world government, —the organ of His power, and of His mighty control over the world. But His disciples also come into union with this heavenly power: first of all, by adopting His name, the definition of His spiritual essence with their being, and thus also the determination of His love upon the world; and, secondly, by asking for themselves in His name His blessings for the world.

In this manner they become the organs of His power, as He is the organ of the Father's power; and thus bring it about that He can do in the world greater and ever greater works, which He equally characterizes as their works, because they perform them in the highest energy of their free life. Moreover, these works must be performed, because the Father must be glorified in the Son. The glory is the power of the Spirit over life in the spiritualized manifestation of life. The Father is to be glorified; that is, it is to become manifest in the phenomenal world, that its whole life is pervaded thoroughly by His Spirit. Moreover, He is to be glorified through the Son; that is, by the

continually increasing manifestation that the Son is the pre-eminently moving power of the world, enlightening everything by His Spirit. Thus is to become revealed the hidden majesty of the Father, which thus pervades the world through the Son. It is promised to the disciples, that this agency of God's glory shall be unfolded to them in a continually higher degree through their life of faith, only they must not forget, entirely and ever more entirely, to ask in His name. And they will always ask more entirely, if they ever acknowledge more fully that *it is He who does it.*

But as He Himself is the glorious centre of His work, so also are the disciples to rejoice in an inner life, which can maintain itself as the free and blessed centre of their efficacy. Christ now indicates this stand-point in the words: 'If ye love Me (Myself), ye will keep My commandments: and I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Advocate,[1] that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.'

Faith in Christ is the source of the energy in the works of God, which are done in His name to the honour of God. More-

[1] That the word Paraclete in the Johannic *usus loquendi* might signify the Advocate, the Intercessor, the Mediator, is shown from 1 John ii. 1. There *Jesus* is the Paraclete of His people *in the presence of the Father.* Here, on the other hand, *the Holy Spirit*, the perfecter of the disciples, is *their Advocate in the face of the* condemning world. Their first Paraclete, in the judgment of the world, was Christ. He sheltered them against the world, and secured to them a free departure (John xviii. 8). But after His ascension He sent to them another Paraclete, who continually gave to them the ascendancy in the face of the world, nay, who Himself condemns the world that condemns; and thus, on behalf of the disciples, changed the defensive into a victorious offensive attitude (John xvi. 8). Comp. Tholuck, 337. [Lightfoot, while he admits that the sense 'Advocate' may be allowed to the word in this place, adds that it may seem more fit to render it by 'Comforter:' for 'amongst all the names and titles given to the Messiah in the Jewish writers, that of "Menahem," or the Comforter, hath chiefly obtained; and the days of the Messiah, amongst them, are styled "the days of consolation."' For the generally received meaning, see Alford's note, with the reference to Hare's *Mission of the Comforter.* Bishop Pearson's note on the word is also valuable, and proves that the notion of intercession cannot at least be omitted from the idea signified (*On the Creed*, p. 477, ed. 1835).—Ed.]

over, from faith in Him proceeds love to Him, which brings about obedience to His commandments. Especially also, the faithful observance of His institution, and which is therefore blessed with the gift of the Holy Spirit. He who loves Christ acknowledges Him in His everlasting nature, and therefore acknowledges also the everlasting value of His appointments. He observes them as the enduring testimonies of the beloved but absent Lord. And thus they become to Him, in consequence of Christ's intercession, media through which He receives the Holy Spirit. As the loving Christian is wholly turned towards his Lord in the living remembrance wherewith he observes his institutions and ordinances, so Christ in His glory is wholly turned in His living intercession to him. The desire of the Christian and the blessing of Christ meet together. And thus the Christian receives the Spirit of his beloved Lord as the life of His commandment, as the living unity of his own Christian life, as the soul of his union with Christ. The Holy Spirit becomes to him *a mediator, an advocate,* inasmuch as He perfects, advocates, and establishes his own life in the judgment which the old world determines upon him; but becomes *another advocate,* in that He supplies to him the presence of Christ, who was to him the first advocate who gave to him courage and joyous power in abundance against all the world. This Comforter will abide with him for ever, *will thus supply to him the presence of Christ, and will give to him security for the inheritance hereafter which Christ is preparing for him.*

It is the characteristic feature of this Spirit, that He is the Spirit of truth. The Spirit of the Spirit in the word, in the life, one may say, in the world, and in the history of Christ. The truth is an infinitely subtle existence in the world, but in relation to the Spirit of God it is comparable to the *body;* whereas this Spirit may be likened to the *soul,* as the celestially pure divine consciousness concerning the living connection of all God's works and words. For this reason, therefore, the *Holy Spirit* is so foreign to the world. The world is perhaps familiar with the *spirit of the age,* with the spirit of phenomenal nature, of external forms—of the progressive manifestations of the world; but it cannot receive the Spirit of God. It sees Him not in God's works and testimonies before its eyes—not at all in the centre of all His revelations in Christ; it acknowledges Him not in His

influences upon its own life. But the disciples know Him; for, first of all, He abides *with* them, in influencing them by the word of Christ; and one day He will be *in* them, when they have received Him into their innermost life.

With the promise of the Holy Spirit, Jesus announced to His disciples that He would make amends to them for His absence, by His spiritual presence; He declares this still more definitely: 'I will not leave you orphans; I am coming to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; *but ye shall see Me.*'

'Because I live, ye shall live also.' Christ lives in the absolute sense. Therefore He goes forth again even from death; and He exists for ever as the eternally living One. And He makes His disciples partakers of the same life, by His Spirit. They also shall live through Him. Therefore they also shall certainly see Him—Him the living One, they the living ones; not only externally after His resurrection, but in the Spirit continually. Then, when they thus see Him, will be the manifestation of the glorious day of the Spirit. 'In that day,' says He, 'ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in Me, and I in you.' I in the Father—absorbed into the depth of His being, and operating in His glory; ye in Me—transplanted with Me into His eternal being, into the sphere of His might; I in you,—living on in your inmost nature, through the other Comforter, ministering on through you in the world.

And once more He tells them how they are to attain this result. In keeping His commandments, they prove their love to Him. Thus they become alive to the experience of the love of God; and with the love of God flows into them the love of Christ so powerfully, that they rejoice in spirit at the revelation of His nature.

Thus Jesus explains that He will reveal Himself in the glory of His kingdom only to those who love Him. This, again, is a declaration which offends the disciples, and most of all Judas Lebbæus: 'Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?' We have before seen that this Judas belonged to the brethren of Jesus, who always wished to urge Him forward on to the stage of the highest publicity; and that he probably was, in fact, the soul of such endeavours, the soul of a family spirit which would fain have seen the Lord in

the glory of the world's acknowledgment (vol. i. p. 429). Hence it is accounted for that Judas considered himself engaged before the rest to propose to the Lord this new doubt as to His future mysterious relation to His disciples and to the world. This is the third difficulty which the worldly mind can find in the doctrine of Christ concerning His government hereafter in the new life. It finds it surprising that He will reveal Himself only to His disciples. Thus the worldly mind continues to ask wherefore Christ thus makes Himself known.

Wherefore is it that *only* His disciples know of Him? wherefore does He not reveal Himself to the world? Thereupon the Lord answers to the questioner, first of all, 'If a man love Me, he will keep My words: and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.' The Father imparts Himself to him, because He finds His image reflected in him—the love of Christ. Christ imparts Himself to him, because He finds His image in him—His word. The Father and the Son visit him from heaven through the Spirit. They condescend to him, because his heart, by the word of Christ, has attained the certainty of life wherein the Spirit of Christ, the presence of the Father, makes itself known—the focus wherein the everlasting Sun inflames and brings to view the heart's own life. Thus familiar is he with the Father, with the Son, that they become his housemates in his heart; his inward nature becomes a resting-place of Christ, a throne of God. Thus it is brought about completely, that Christ reveals Himself to such an one.

But this mediation is exactly what is wanting between Christ and the world. 'He that loveth Me not,' He continues, 'keepeth not My sayings.' And therewith is expressed the fact also, that he keepeth not the words of the Father. Christ explains this in the saying, 'The word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me.' Thus, to such an one is wanting the condition on which the Father and the Son make themselves known to the human spirit: the word as the spiritual determination of the revelation of Christ, which He fills with His Spirit, and thereby makes into His presence; the word as the brightness of the knowledge of God, in which the Father makes known His nature and life to the soul. Now the world is just in this case. The world, as world, is humanity, which is lost in the world, is

ensnared into the finite, and refers everything only to the finite. Therefore it cannot love Christ, because His nature just consists in revealing the infinite life of the Father; and because it cannot love Him generally, on account of its love of the finite, it cannot keep His words—it cannot even receive them in their Christ-like ideality, as single light-forms of infinity. And thus, moreover, it is incapable of experiencing the life-operation of Christ, of receiving His Spirit. It has only forebodings of the eternal, obscured by worldly illusions; not the defined light pictures of the knowledge of the everlasting in His word. Therefore it cannot receive the full operation of Christ and of the Father; it cannot perceive the Holy Spirit, but only the vanishing forms of the time-spirits, which come and go with the changeful appearances of the finite. The sun can only increase its operation, so as to give intelligence of its energetic presence, when its beams are not checked, when its light can freely go forth. Thus it is also with the manifestation of Christ. Only where His light is present in His word this light is gradually filled with the entire power of His life, so that He is dynamically present, although in His glorified humanity He is throned in heaven. And where the fulness of His being manifests itself, there the Father Himself is manifested.

Moreover, in the degree that the world has Him not, it has not the Father. In the same degree, the everlasting living and personal God is unknown to it. It has dim, cloudy, and distorted heathenish forms of God; perhaps after the conception of the Brachmans, or of the Buddhists; perhaps in the likeness of a Zeus, or of a Woden; but the essential manifestation of the Father has never dawned upon it.

Thus much on this subject, on the continued life for them and in them which He will carry on in heaven, Christ says, He had wished to say unto them while He was still with them. But He declares further, they should learn much more upon the subject from the Paraclete. 'But the Paraclete,' says He—'the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.' He will thus produce a threefold result. He will quicken the word of Christ in them. He will glorify His name to them. He will reveal the Father to them. Thus these results He will operate in them by the one operation of instructing

them as the Holy Ghost—as the Life-Spirit of the unity and perfection of all the revelations of God—which is opposed to all the finiteness of the world, and contradicts all its mortality—which restores men from the unholy relations of perishableness back into their eternal relation to the Eternal God, which thus sanctifies them, and instructs them in the same degree; that is, makes them more and more capable of the knowledge of the Everlasting, and fills them more and more with this knowledge.

With this promise Christ says, He will now take leave of them, or rather salute them in the power of His nature, as He breaks forth into the words, 'Peace I leave with you (separating from them as if for a farewell greeting), *My* peace I *give* unto you (as the greeting of everlasting fellowship, and therefore suggestive of the earliest meeting again [1]): not as the world gives it, give I the farewell greeting—the salutation of peace.'

In that hour the world also gave to the disciples its farewell greeting—it gave to them a dismissal with terror and for ever. Thus it likes to take leave, although its greeting of welcome has flattered and deceived, and its greeting in daily intercourse has been without spirit and without blessing. Not so Christ. His farewell, in His last salutation of peace to His disciples, is the bequest of heavenly peace itself, and the pledge of the new salutation, soon returning with the richest measure of heavenly peace. In this power He says to them: I leave you My farewell; I offer you My living salutation—in the promise, namely, I live, and ye shall live also. Thus it might perhaps be said that this is the *real* adieu which He gives to them; that He goes to the Father, and assures them that He will return to them with the Father by His Spirit, wherewith also they come with Him to the Father.

Thus He comes back to the word of exhortation wherewith He began this address: 'Let not your heart be troubled nor cast down, neither let it be afraid.' [2]

[1] The formula שָׁלוֹם לְךָ, לָכֶם may also be understood as a formula of farewell—not only as a formula of salutation. Lücke, ii. 617. That in the present case both are intended—the farewell and the assurance of continued fellowship and of speedy meeting again—is proved by the distinction ἀφίημι ὑμῖν—δίδωμι ὑμῖν. Equally so also by the previous passage, ver. 26. But in the subsequent verse this thought comes most plainly forward in the words ὑπάγω καὶ ἔρχομαι, etc.

[2] Μηδὲ δειλιάτω. [Cf. Isa. xiii. 7, 8 (LXX.), and Lampe *in loc.*]

Stagger not at the glory—not at the glory of the certainty of God—of the certainty of Christ—of the certainty of immortality—of the certainty of victory and resurrection, He, as it were, cries to them as He leaves them, repeating once more the great word of consolation: '*Ye have heard* that I have said to you, *I go away, and come again to you.*' His going away itself is a powerful coming again to His disciples.

By way of encouragement and reproof, He then adds: 'If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice, because I go to the Father: for the Father is greater than I.'

Between the two last passages there is a thought unexpressed which forms the transition. By ascertaining what this thought is, we shall perhaps explain the last words.

The disciples ought to rejoice that Christ goes to the Father, if they truly love Him. Why? Because the Father is greater than He. The significance of this argument only subsists in the fact that a change will arise in His relation to the greater Father by His going to Him—that He Himself shall thereby, in some sense, become greater. And thus it is, in fact, He will be glorified in going to the Father.

In His human pilgrimage He appears as the infinitely conditioned Son of the everlasting, unconditioned, all-conditioning Father. In His going home to the Father, on the contrary, He returns to the participation of His supra-mundane, all-controlling majesty. He is glorified. The eternal priority, indeed, which the Father has as the Father is thus not abolished; but the everlasting oneness of the Son with the Father,—the likeness of essence,—is set forth even in its world-historical perfection. The Holy Spirit will give to His disciples testimony of this glory of the Son.

Thus He continues: 'And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe.' And why does He wish to commend to them so earnestly this proof of faith? 'Hereafter,' says He, 'I will not talk much with you.'

'For the prince of this world cometh (is already near), and has nothing which belongs to him in Me.'

The world, as world, in its perishableness is now opposing itself to the Lord as the reflection of the Eternal Father for a decisive struggle. In this hostility it is governed and led on by

its prince the devil, as prince of this world—as the innermost principle of all the mortality of humanity in that which is finite (as the ὁ διάβολος, who confuses everything), which disturbs the ideal unity of life. He draws near to the Prince of Light, in order to tempt Him also with the storm of the horror of death.

He has nothing that belongs to him in Me, says Christ. Thus He not only declares His own righteousness, but also the certainty of His victory and resurrection. Everything in Him belongs to the kingdom of light, even His body also. Thus, moreover, is decided the early separation from the disciples. Christ again overcomes the world. But at the same time is declared thereby, that Christ experiences no wavering of His courage—knows no fear, in the face of the approaching and threatening prince of this world.

He declares this in His conclusion: 'But that the world may know that I love the Father, and that I exactly fulfil the commission of the Father as He gave it me, prepare yourselves,[1] and let us go hence.' He has thus a perfectly clear consciousness that He is yielding not to the force of the prince of this world, but to the might of the Father; and solemnly announces that in this step is no remnant of unfreedom or constraint, but the free purpose of surrender to the decree of the Father. Thus was the departure accomplished.

Before crossing the Kidron, however, the Lord was once more induced to utter a longer discourse to His disciples. This address forms a distinct contrast with the previous one. In the *former*, Christ shows how He *would be their Advocate in heaven* with the Father, and how they in union with Him would lead a life above the world; in the present, on the other hand, He shows how *they* were to set forth *His life* on earth in *the present world*, and how He would continue to govern in them, and through them, upon earth.

At first the Lord sets before the disciples, in a parabolic discourse, how they are to prosecute His life in the world (ch. xv. 1–8); then He gives them a closer explanation of this discourse (vers. 9–17). Hereupon He shows them how, in the manifestation of His life in the world, they must incur substantially the

[1] The expression ἐγείρεσθε implies, perhaps, an encouragement to the exercise of the highest courage and resolution—not merely a summons to get up, as if until then they had been lying down.

same hatred which He Himself has undergone, and still undergoes (ver. 18, ch. xvi. 6). This leads Him further to renew to them the promise of the Holy Spirit; because this is to be their Advocate in the most glorious manner in the face of the world, and endow them with all the fulness of God and of His life (vers. 7–16). To this are linked the final explanations on the manner in which He will take His departure from them, and in which He will return (vers. 17–30; comp. Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28. Then He knows that they are sufficiently prepared to receive as a body His announcement that they would be offended at Him—would faint-heartedly forsake Him (vers. 31, 32; comp. Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 31.) But His closing word confirms to them the bequest of His peace, and gives to them the assurance that He has substantially already overcome the world (ver. 33). In this assurance He commits them to the Father in the most earnest intercession (ch. xvii.).

The suggestion which prompted to Jesus the parable of the vine, has been sought for by different people in various circumstances. Some thought that they found it in the partaking of wine in the holy communion; others supposed that a vine must have grown around the guest-chamber where the Lord and His disciples were assembled, and must so have offered itself to the Lord for the similitude; others, again, referred it to that gorgeous metallic vine with which Herod had adorned the high door of the temple.[1] It may not perhaps be denied that some relation between the significance of the wine in the Lord's Supper and the fruits of the vine of which the Lord is here speaking, subsists in this place; but the fundamental view is in this instance a totally different one. Here, for instance, it is the *vine branches* especially that are in question—their relation to the vine, to the vine-dresser, and to the purpose of the vine to bear fruit. But as to the relation of the parable to a vine on the house where the guest-chamber was, we have to consider that the distinct summons of Jesus to departure is

[1] See Lücke, ii. 627. According to Lücke, the notice, xviii. 1, is inconsistent with Christ being at this time passing between vineyards. But the ἐξῆλθεν in that place does not perhaps necessarily refer to the departure of Christ from the walls of Jerusalem—the less that it may probably be supposed that the precincts of the city had extended down as far as the Kidron. The leading thought of the text lies in the reference of ἐξῆλθεν to the more special definition, πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Κεδρών.

gone by; that house has already disappeared from our sight. To the symbolic vine on the temple mountain, moreover, Jesus hardly came with the disciples on that night; besides, it is not to be supposed that the lively symbol of Jesus is to be referred to an artificial symbol in the temple.[1]

Besides, it has been remembered how significant is the feature that the unfruitful branches were cut off, that they were cast into the fire. This characteristic especially places us, in our consideration, actually among the vineyards, and therein gives us also, as we have already seen, the historical connection.

'I am the *true*[2] vine,' says Christ, 'and My Father is the vine-dresser.' Into this simple and noble representation He gathers up in this terrible night His entire relation to the world and to the disposal of the Father. What the vine is in the sense of an earthly, transient, and symbolic phenomenon, He Himself is in the sense of the highest Realism of the imperishable relations of the eternal world. The eternal vine in the midst of the world and of humanity, in which the typical designation of Israel to be the vine of the nations[3] has been fully developed and fulfilled, whose shoots are represented by men in their relation to Him, especially in the historical relation of discipleship to Him, and whose roots in the life of the Logos permeate the entire territory of the world—or rather, as life-element of its innermost nature, project out of themselves and take back into themselves—He is the true vine. From this representation is explained His whole nature and destiny, the

[1] [Tholuck supposes that the similitude was suggested by 'a vine perhaps trailing by the side of the window,' *i.e.*, of the supper room. Lampe (iii. 200) thinks (and so Meyer and Ellicott) that the occasion of the figure was the 'fruit of the vine,' which had just been used as the symbol of all the benefits of the New Testament. He adds, 'Forte quoque Jesus e regione et ad radices montis Templi ad torrentem Kidron accedens respicere potuit ad *vitem* illam *auream*, quæ secundum Josephum et alios insigne Templi secundi ornamentum fuit, et limen atrii obumbravit.' Stier gives a threefold ground for the image: 'The two certain and related grounds are nature in itself and the prophetic phraseology which interprets nature, the third is introduced by the recently instituted Supper.' In Alford's note on this passage, for *Lampe* read *Lange*.—ED.]

[2] Ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή. Compare vol. ii. pp. 177-8. [Ἀληθινὸς est, qui non tantum nomen habet et speciem, sed veram naturam et indolem, quæ nomini conveniat.' Tittmann, *Synonyms of the N. T.*, ii. 28.—ED.]

[3] Isa. v. i.

nobleness of His being, the weakness of His appearance, the power of His ministry, the glory of His results, the greatness of His sufferings in the season when He comes under the knife of the pruner, the greatness of the jubilee in the day of His harvest. But it is especially to be considered as a characteristic of the glorious and complete confidence in the view of Christ, that He points to the Father as the vine-dresser.

Thus, simply, on this night does He bring the entire dark arrangement of His Father into the view of the most conscious, most subtle, and most noble activity. Thus the Father is to Him, thus to His disciples, in all His decrees, in His heaviest judgments even, He has nothing else in view than the progress of the vine, the cultivation of its branches, the fruits of the harvest.

Still, the Lord has especially to do with the image of the branches, to which He first of all likens His disciples. At first their relation to the vine-dresser comes into consideration. They are to know that they *must* undergo the sorrows which await them, just because they are branches in Him. The branches must be pruned; the knife of the vine-dresser passes threateningly around all, and all must suffer. Still He makes a great distinction. 'Every branch which bears no fruit is *cut off* (that the vine may be purified from it); but every branch which bears fruit is purified, is thus *pruned*,[1] that it may bear more fruit.' Thus are the disciples instructed that sorrows await them from the hand of the vine-dresser. Still He gives them the consolation, that they shall not be cut off if they only stedfastly abide in Him. 'Ye are pure,' says He, 'through the word that I have spoken to you.' They have already the first form of purity—the pure relation to the vine—in that they are united with Christ in a living manner through the word of His life which He has given them. If they keep this word they shall not be cut off from Him, but shall once more be purified only through sorrow, according to their destination for the harvest.

Thus is the relation of the branches to the vine indicated: 'Abide in Me, and I in you.' How? *He* tells them subsequently; at present they are first to consider that they *must abide* in Him. 'As the branch,' says the Lord, 'cannot bring forth

[1] The contrast: *αἴρει αὐτό* and *καθαίρει αὐτό* comes out clearly.

fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing.' Thus, as the branches must receive their life, their sap, their power to bring forth fruit, from the vine, so must the disciples from Christ. This is their only, their highest law of life. To abide in the vine—to abide in the energy of the vine—to abide deep in the life and the living impulse of its root and of its sap, so that the vine also abides in them—that they are associated with it, not as languid or wild sprouts, as strange shoots, alienated from the spirit of growth.

It is not the external connection with the vine that is the abiding of the branch in it. If the internal connection of the branch with the vine ceases,—the unity in respect of the energy of putting forth fruit, it is only a hurtful and troublesome stick on the vine. And because it has remained united with it, but not internally, the pruner destroys even the outward connection —it is cut off.

'Thus,' says Christ, 'the disciple who abides not in Him is cast away—cast forth as a branch—he is withered;[1] and is thus heaped together with other branches as brushwood, cast into the fire, and in flickering light flame is consumed by the fire' (*καὶ καίεται*).

But as the excellent branch is to be regretted if it thus fails of its purpose, and perishes as worthless fuel in a light flickering fire of brushwood, so it is a terrible misfortune if, in like manner, a disciple falls short of his purpose. How plainly, doubtless, the frightful destiny of Judas occurs to the soul of the Lord, as He utters these words! But how entirely different is the lot of the disciples if they fulfil their appointment; that is, if they abide in Christ in such a manner as that His words abide in them actually as His words, namely, as *bright certainties of life and principles of life.* In that case, He says, they shall ask what they will, and it shall be done unto them. Their entire wish before God will thus be bestowed on them. More-

[1] The aorist form is here significant, *ἐβλήθη*; *ἐξηράνθη*. In such a case, the disciple who does not abide in Jesus is in fact already cast off, and is conceived of as on the way to wither.

over, they will attain their true destination in a threefold form. They will, in the first place, bear *much fruit*. The new wine of peace and joy of the eternal feast of the kingdom of heaven will be communicated by their means in abundant measure to humanity. Thus, moreover, in the second place, they will, for the first time, perfectly become[1] the disciples of Jesus in the highest sense—organs, copies, representatives of His life in the world. Then thirdly, again they will thereby add to the glory of the Father. Through them it will be fully manifest and notorious, that the Lord of the world is not a Fate—not a Saturn, or a Pan, or any other dim form of divinity, but the living God, who has revealed Himself in Christ, and reconciled the world—even the Father—the Godhead, which, with its Spirit, pervades all the life of all the universe round about, and through and through. Through them, this glory of the Father shall become manifest.

They will thus come to the highest satisfaction of their life as far as they are concerned; and this satisfaction will appear as the most glorious blessing, first of all, in relation to humanity; secondly, in relation to Christ; thirdly, in relation to the Father.

Hereupon Jesus passes on to explain to them the parable still more in detail, especially in the point, *that they are*, and *how they are*, to *abide* in Him.

The fundamental law for this abode of the disciples in Christ is this: 'As the Father hath loved Me (hath chosen Me unto love), so have I loved you; continue ye in My love.'

The Father beholds the Son as His express image—looks on Him in His unity with satisfaction from eternity—in this love He has chosen Him. It is, therefore, a word of unspeakable importance, when Christ says to the disciples, 'So have I loved you.' Thus He has acknowledged, saluted, chosen them, with perfect view of their features of character, of their destiny, of the certainty of their association with Him. And as it is His

[1] They must previously be true disciples of Jesus to bring forth fruits, that is, specifically Christ-like fruits; for the fruit does not constitute the branch, still less the vine; rather the fruit proceeds from the branch, the branch from the vine. And still, on the other hand, they do not become in the highest and most perfect sense His disciples until they are approved by bringing forth fruit.

blessedness and righteousness continually to contemplate and to be absorbed into the love of the Father, and to find Himself beloved in it; thus it must be their blessedness and righteousness to be absorbed into this love, and to find themselves again in this love, and to learn to comprehend how they are in Him.

If they would thus abide in Him, they must abide in His love. But how do they abide in His love? Here there is no mention of the production and maintenance of a constant ecstatic state. 'If ye keep My commandments (the New Testament ordinances of Jesus), ye shall abide in My love; even as I have kept My Father's commandments (the Old Testament covenant institutions of God, which are leading Him through the law even to the death on the cross), and abide in His love.'

He then explains to them the intention with which He has now pressed upon their heart the admonition to remain in His love. 'These things have I spoken unto you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.' The joy of Christ is the eternally free, festal, undulating movement of His soul in the consciousness of the Father's love; therefore imperishable, because He knows Himself always beloved by the Father, however much the perception of it may be obscured by the judgment of the world. This joy moves Him even now, while the disciples are moving joylessly around Him. They must thus know what is wanting to them. They must thus be absorbed in the consciousness of being Christ-beloved beings in the fellowship of the God-beloved Lord—of being beloved by Him, and in Him—of being beloved by the Father, whereby they thus stand in direct relation to the everlasting fountain of joy, whereby the joy of Christ flows over upon them, till their joy is completed in the blessedness.

But He finds it necessary now more fully to explain to them the instruction to keep His commandment.

'This is My commandment (the substance of My lawgiving or institution), that ye love one another, even as I have loved you.' And how has He loved them? 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' From His stand-point Christ knows that He only dies for His friends although He dies for men, even although they are still enemies; for they become His friends in the power of His death, and they only experience the power of His death in the degree

in which they become His friends. This truth binds the believers all the more to acknowledge that they were not yet His decided friends when He gave His life for them. Nay, that they were all still His enemies, inasmuch as His determination to die for men precedes all acts of surrender on the part of men to Him.[1] Jesus Himself intimates, that He could only call His disciples His friends conditionally, so far as He looks to their position towards Him. 'Ye are My friends,' says He, 'if ye do whatsoever I command you.' But as for Him, He will, notwithstanding, from henceforward call them friends, but not servants. For what constitutes the servant is, that he knoweth not what his lord doeth. He knows only his separate commands. He is not initiated into his motive, nor placed on his standpoint by affinity and fellowship of spirit. It is otherwise in this case. Christ tells the disciples that He has made known unto them all that He has heard of the Father (all that was intrusted to Him for them).[2] And thus even already He has saluted them as friends. On His side the friendship was thus actually decided, if it also, on their side, in some measure should stand the test. But thus He further says it is fitting, as He reminds them, 'Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you.'

He had chosen them and ordained them. This ordination has a twofold expression. First, it declares their mission as it appears in the conditioning of their life. They are to go forth (to go forth in their apostolic calling, and in their earthly separation from Him, into the contest), and to bring forth fruit, and to leave the fruit behind, *as abiding*, as an imperishable seed of the kingdom of God in the world. Then He declares the unconditionality of their mission—that they were appointed to it; whatsoever they should ask of the Father in His name, He would give them. Hereupon He repeats the commandment in which the whole law of life is comprised by Him, that they were to love one another. This He enjoins upon them first of all by His word, then by His example—His death, which is a death first of all for them[3]—finally, by His Spirit.

The mutual love of Christians, in the measure and in the

[1] There is thus no contradiction between John xv. 13 and Rom. v. 7-10. Compare John xv. 16.

[2] Thus this passage agrees with v. 16, 12. *Vide* Tholuck, 347.

[3] See John xviii. 8.

power of the love which Christ has shown to them, is the essence of the Christian law of life. Moreover, as Christ died for true Christians who once had been no friends of His, and whose friendship was still unapproved in any individual, the reciprocity of His disciples' love must consist not merely in the love of decided believers for those who stand upon the same ground as themselves, but also for those in whom they must first seek out and enliven the features of relationship, as Christ sought out and quickened them in His disciples.

Thus shall He know His appointment in a distinct and approved manner. The kingdom of light—the Church of His disciples—is the kingdom of mutual love, of love in the divine heroic measure, according to which the one can sacrifice his life for the other. Here is declared, first of all, that this kingdom must separate itself in the sharpest manner from the dominion of the world that hates it. Secondly, that it must excite this hatred, and experience it in its whole development towards itself. Thirdly, that it must overcome it, precisely by refusing to be confounded by its perils, but remaining always self-possessed.

The disciples, moreover, need not be confounded in their vocation of representing the life of Christ in the world. 'If the world hate you,' says the Lord and Master, 'ye know that it hated Me before it hated you.' Yea, they were to take to themselves this hatred as a good sign: 'If ye were of the world, the world would love his own (his own self-entanglement in you). But because (by the dominant principle of your life) ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore (because of the character which Christ has recognised in you, which He developes in you, because ye are thus elected and beloved of Christ) the world hateth you. Remember the word which I said unto you,[1] The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you: if they have kept My saying, they will keep yours also.'

And once again He tells them that it is not their own that the world hates in them, but His—His name; yea, that the enmity of the world against Him allows itself to be manifested so much, only because it does not know the Father. For the name of the Son is actually the expression for the being of the

[1] Compare Matt. x. 24.

Father (Heb. i. 3). If, then, the world hates His name, it cannot possibly acknowledge with love the being of the Father.

But this denial of the Father is a guilt of the world. 'If I had not come,' says He, 'and spoken unto them, they had not had sin' (the sin of the positive denial of the Father as the Father). This sin, for instance, in its mature form, was not possible until the manifestation of the Son, who revealed the Father to the world. But in its beginnings it is contained in every sin; for every sin is an offence against the secret testimony of the Logos—against the beginnings of the teaching of the Word of God in the heart,—of the Word (*of the eternal brightness*), by which the Father makes Himself known. Since the revelation of Christ, however, it became the great sin of the new age to deny the Father, in order to establish in His place the threadbare images of God of the heathenish world-view. Thus now, as it seems, just for that reason they have no cloke for their sin. Moreover, that He by this sin of unbelief signifies the positive denial of the Father, He plainly declares: 'He that hateth Me, hateth My Father also.' This word expresses the counterpart of the previous one: Whosoever hath seen Me, hath seen the Father. And, as Christ then observed (xiv. 11), if a man do not believe Him for His own sake, yet He must still be believed for the very works' sake, He must even now characterize the unbelief which could still hold out against His works as the most decided form of unbelief: 'If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin. But now have they seen Me and My Father (in the works), and have hated Me and Him.' This is the case continuously of all ministries of Christ through Christianity in the world. 'But this cometh to pass,' He adds, 'that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hate Me without a cause.' Even this word found in Christ, for the first time, its highest *fulfilment; perfectly sinless*, He must experience the *perfectly groundless* hatred. It is the first comfort, that all this hatred is foreseen by God—is determined in His decree. The second is this, it is utterly without reason, and therefore also utterly vain. And this is the third consolation: the Paraclete whom Christ will send to His disciples from the Father—that Spirit of Christ's life whom He can communicate to His people when He is returned home to the Father—that Spirit, as

the Spirit of truth, who goes forth from the Father, will testify of Him. Firstly, because He is the Spirit of the truth which appeared bodily in Him whose King and centre He is, who must always refer back again to Him; then also because He comes from the Father, reciprocally with the fact that Christ is gone to the Father. But this witness of the Holy Spirit will be united with their witness as its living soul: 'And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning.' Thus this was to be their relation, as opposed to the hatred of the world.

And as He said to them of His love, that they must continue in it, that their joy might be full; so He said the worst to them of the hatred of the world. And as they were to resist it by the testimony of Christ in union with the testimony of the Holy Spirit, so they were not to be offended—not to lose their faith in Him, by the experience of this hatred of the world.

The persecution, He says, will begin by their being thrust out of the synagogue, or excommunicated; and it will become more severe, till the time shall come when it will be considered an act of divine service[1] to slay them. Moreover, this fanatical hatred will always have the same foundation—an equal denial of the Father as of the Son. (Thus it is not at all any partial denial of the Son in one-sided but true adoration of the brightness and majesty of the Father,—or the reverse.)

It is true that the Lord had predicted to them from the beginning that they, in following Him, must expect privations (Matt. viii. 20). He had also subsequently announced to them, that for His sake they would have to undergo great sufferings (Matt. x.). But He said to them now for the first time, that it would one day be considered by the world as meritorious—that the world would make of it a kind of God's service—to put them to death; or, moreover, that they would be hated even to death by those who professed to be God's servants—the fanatically pious in the world—and that they would be sacrificed to the prince of this world in horrible Moloch-offerings, under the delusion that it was rendering God Himself a service thereby. Thus the disciples were in the position now of hearing for the first time of the sorrows which awaited them in following Jesus. They were terribly discouraged.

[1] A festival of faith, an auto-da-fé.

This discouragement induced the Lord to assure them that He had said this in order to provide them with a sign for the hour of their calamity itself. When, by and bye, their sorrows came, they might remember Him—that He has foretold it to them—and on this sign of His prescient Spirit they might then take courage and comfort in affliction.

At the same time, He tells them why He had not spoken to them these extreme and painful things from the beginning, namely, because He was then with them. 'But now,' He adds, 'I go My way to Him that sent Me.' He would not tell them the grievous word before the time; but, also, He would not let them become acquainted with their painful course too late. This is according to the divine arrangement. The kindness of Providence conceals from man the terrors that are to come upon him so long as the knowledge of them would only perplex him, or, rather, so long as he neither will nor can apprehend the announcement of them; but *the truthfulness* of Providence begins to withdraw from him the veil which hides these terrors —by portents, so soon as he needs this withdrawal for his preparation. And thus the Lord perceives it to be necessary now to place His disciples absolutely in front of the picture of what was impending over them. Still, even here, He neither can nor may oppose to the statement: 'Hitherto I have been with you;—the words, 'Henceforth I shall no more be with you.' For although, indeed, He goes His way, yet it is to the Father, that He may live there for them.

But this word of consolation is far from making a lively impression on them yet. He cannot but cry with amazement, 'And none of you asketh Me, Whither goest Thou?' Assuredly the disciples were still in a mood to maintain very energetically the *interest of the present life*. Certainly enthusiasm for the interest of time cannot be asserted to be a new idea. Once in the earlier and fairer days of Israel, this enthusiasm, in its artlessly religious form, was perfectly in bloom. It occupied so prominently the religious consciousness of the Israelites, that many have thought that the doctrine of immortality was wanting in the Old Testament—the doctrine, namely, of the higher life of the world to come. But in the days of the Israelitish nation's misfortune, the prophetic spirit had already begun to elicit the doctrine of the future which lay *a priori* in the theo-

cratic germ of Christianity.[1] Notwithstanding, the predilection for a visible glorification of the *present* was always tending to become powerful among the Jews, and begat various chiliastic fanciful forms. And thus, in these moments, the disciples appeared as advocates of that mighty prepossession against the importance of the future world. They look sadly, gloomily, doubtingly upon all the mysterious intimations of Jesus, rich in promises as they were,—so sorrowfully, that it never occurs to one of them to inquire after the nature of that inheritance into which their Master is going, or after the manner and form of the new life.

It is quite plain here, that fuller disclosures about the future life would have even then been given in reply to the anxiety of the disciples of Christ, had they manifested, or been able to manifest, a stronger inclination, and thence also a susceptibility and capacity, to receive those fuller revelations. Even in the later and more considerable disclosures of this kind which the Lord gave to the apostles, He adapted Himself to the ripeness of their susceptibility for the revelation of the future state, and to the necessities of His Church. Thus the richest communications of this nature which were given to the maturest apostles in their moments of highest illumination, had for the more ordinary mind of the Church an enigmatical and obscure character. The mind of Christians is, commonly, still too much entangled in the course of this world's life, and in the pain of the death which leads beyond it; but especially in the thousandfold sorrow of parting and separation which is associated with that last journey, to be able in this relation to reach so easily from the stand-point of the vastest spirit-labour to that of the serene spirit-festival, and thus to comprehend the higher communications of the Lord on the subject of the future life.

But this disposition is still prevalent in the disciples in considerable measure. Instead of their interest being in some degree aroused by the declaration of Jesus, so full of promise, their heart, as the Lord now expressly says, was completely filled with sadness. Thus He goes further now, and tells them most definitely, that even for their present life it would be an advantage that He should part from them. 'Moreover I tell you the truth, It is expedient for you that I go away.' This is

[1] Compare Isa. liii. 8.

the important passage which serves to the Christian for the first spiritual glorification of the present state. The proof is divided into two parts. First of all, Christ supposes the case of His not going away; then, says He, the Paraclete will not come to you. Then He declares the result of the fact of His actual departure: 'But if I go away, I will send Him unto you.'

Thus the Lord returns, with the repeated announcement of His departure, to the promise of the Holy Spirit. This promise is associated with the condition, that He Himself in His visible manifestation should leave His disciples and go out of the world.

Humanity is so deeply sunken by sin into fleshliness and unspiritualized sensuousness, that it has unlearned the faculty of seeing the reality of the spirit before it or around it. Everywhere the immediate reality appears to it obscured and perished, not only because it is mostly darkened by sin, and testifies of sin, but rather because it is most looked upon by sinful eyes. Hence the immense contrast between poetry and reality. Man regards the ideal as unreal, the real as not ideal. He attributes to the spirit no substantiality, to substantiality no spirit. In *reality* he not only characterizes the sin as evil, but the suffering too. Nay, he rather calls the suffering the sin, although the suffering is the reaction against the sin, the first natural judgment upon it, which in consequence everywhere secures the relative ideality of the reality. And not only does he call suffering evil, but even the appearance of suffering manifested to him according to his sinful suppositions; for instance, that Christ grew up in Nazareth—that He does not change the stones into bread—that He does not expel the Romans from the land—that He is ready to suffer.

Therefore man never beholds the working of God except when He has passed by,[1] or with the glimpse of hope as He is advancing, but not in His actual presence. Faith does not fully grasp the present grace and truth, save by the remote beat of the wings of memory and of hope. Generally, man thus beholds the earth on its fairer and more poetic side only in the blue haze of distance, and he does not appreciate the poetry of home till in a wholly foreign land he learns it in the home sorrow that vents itself in poesy.[2] Hence he sees in the circumstances that

[1] Compare Ex. xxxiii. 23.

[2] Ps. cxxxvii.

lie nearest to him incompleteness[1] prevailing—in his nearest associations the constant prevalence only of labour and effort; his eye is always captivated by what he cannot possess and cannot reach, as being the more perfect thing. And thus also he looks upon heaven *as only beyond the stars*, or in the starry world; but the heavenly upon earth disappears from him. Even in those moments when Christ wandered upon earth, this was the prevalent disposition with the disciples: it is the same in later times, when He is continually upon earth in His Church and by His Spirit. In a word, man cannot see the working of God in the world purely, because the world has become to him by his worldliness an enchanted labyrinth of endlessly complicated limitations, and the incarnation of Infinity itself in Christ seems to him, under the thousand reflected lights of the finite (in the fact, for instance, that Christ is a Nazarene, a Jew, nay, even that He is a *man*), as a finite fact; nay, actually Christ Himself appears to him as the nature laden with the whole curse of finiteness.

And everything appears to him in this way, because, as the victim of sinful entanglement, he will see in the *divine ordinance of conditionality* only the *curse of finiteness*, and not the *grace and truth of the divine definition.*

Therefore humanity could not possibly arrive at a clear knowledge of the revelation of God in Christ so long as Christ was with His disciples on earth. If He purposed to complete the revelation of God as the greatest prophet, He must go far away from the sinful, carnal eyes of His disciples, and the world—far away into a remote land (Luke xix. 12). Humanity must first learn again to look[2] out of the depth of its nature, and before all things it must first again learn to see in spirit. This going away of Christ happened in a threefold gradation with threefold effect. By His death He was crucified to visible

[1] Ach, Kein Steg will dahin führen,
Ach, der Himmel über mir
Will die Erde nie berühren,
Und das *Dort* ist niemals *Hier*.—SCHILLER, *Der Pilgrim.*
Compare Faust, Pt. 2, Act 5.

[2] Compare Matt. xiii. 16. Probably the reference here is to that emphatic seeing and hearing which began in the life of the disciples, when they saw Him who was the express image of the Father, heard Him who was the eternal Word.

things. Moreover, by it visible things (in their old, dim, finite, decaying light) were crucified to His disciples.[1] Nay, thereby was likewise crucified[2] their former manner of beholding with bewildered eye, in manifold phenomena, only the fallacious glitter of the lust of the eyes, of the flesh, and of the pride of life,[3] and not of discerning the substantial lustre, the beautiful, and in it the Spirit. By His resurrection He revealed Himself as the living originator of a visibility which is entirely glorified into spirit (Luke xxiv. 37), of a spirit-life which is manifested in perfect visibility (John xx. 27). Then, secondly, He thereby set Himself forth as the principle and the pledge of a new world, which in like manner was to reveal the glory of God—that is, the pervading rule of God's Spirit through all flesh. And thus He called forth in His disciples the beginning of this new power of vision out of the inmost soul, and in the entire power of bodily vision (John xx. 16). At His ascension He finally comprehended both these operations in a third, into the highest consummation of the poetic effect which ideal distance produces upon man. He made His life the centre of all the aspiration of the higher human life into the dim distance—the centre of all the affectionate, and as it were homesick, remembrance of His disciples—of every longing hope contained in the gaze into the future. And thus He made His retreat, His heaven the paradise of all the real poetry of the affections, of pious yearning, of memory, and of hope upon earth. And thus, finally, to dwell with Him became the great aim of life to Christian humanity.

And thus Jesus could complete the revelation of God to His disciples by withdrawing from them to the Father, and leaving behind to them the memory of His life. But not only as the great Prophet of God, but also as the High Priest, and as the King of humanity, He must first by His going home complete His work in the threefold gradation of His death, His resurrection, and ascension, before He could communicate the Holy Spirit to them. We are able at this place, only to throw out suggestions, as we must return to this point subsequently.

As in the character of Prophet He abolished *the illusion* of the flesh by His death, set forth *the truth* of the flesh by His resurrection, and established *the glorification* of the flesh by His

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 18. [2] Gal. vi. 14. [3] 1 John ii. 16.

ascension; so in the character of High Priest, by His death on the cross He expiated the *guilt* of all the fleshliness of the world; by His resurrection He affirmed the everlasting claim and the value of corporeity; and in His ascension laid the foundation for the appearance of humanity before God hereafter in the priestly robes of a perfected corporeity devoted to God. Moreover, as the King of humanity, He has by His death taken away all the *weakness* of the flesh (for instance, the fear of death); by His resurrection He brought to light the imperishable power of victory over death of the spiritual bodiliness; by His ascension, finally, He laid the foundation for a kingdom in which the Spirit is everlastingly to pervade and renew all corporeity—wherein corporeity, received into the consciousness of spirit, is to permeate the world with spiritual power.

In such a manner He completed His life in His going home to the Father—completed it for the world. And thus it must be completed, if His disciples were to become partakers of the Holy Ghost. For, first of all, the Holy Ghost is the living unity of the perfected revelation—of the perfected life of Christ. Thus, so long as His life was not completed in all its characteristics, the Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, could not in its fulness pass over to His disciples. He is, moreover, the Spirit of the Father. Therefore, so long as the revelation of the Father was not completed in the exaltation of Christ, He could not, in this determination of His nature, go forth from the Father. Finally, He is the Holy Spirit in respect of His own life, the Spirit which absolutely denies every perishable nature of finiteness in the world; and in every consciousness filled therewith, makes known His own consciousness in every consecrated personality—makes known His own personality in every focus of His manifestation—makes known the infinitely free, blessed comprehension of all His life. Therefore He could not make Himself known to the disciples of Christ, so long as the old world was not abolished by the death of Christ—so long as the new world was not established by the exaltation of Christ, and *both* as well before their eyes as in their hearts.

By the continued abode of the historic Christ in the old world, there would have been established a threefold, or rather a thrice threefold deficiency, which must have continued to afflict His disciples. The world would have remained to them the old

world, in its deceiving, blinding lights, in its terrifying shadows, in its profane secularity—penetrated with the fear of judgment, with temptations to sullen self-immolation, with the appearance of an everlasting war of extermination between spirit and sense—filled with the terror of death, with contradictions of the possibility of the glorification of the body, of the hope of eternal life;—that is, that to them the world would have remained filled with sheer hindrances to the revelation of that Spirit which in all the world denies nothing but sin, and which, notwithstanding, sin denies through all the world; and which actually, as the Holy Spirit, presupposes the absolutely completed holy life in order to make it a principle of sanctification, and so at the same time of regeneration and glorification of all life.

It was thus actually a gain for Christendom, for humanity, that Christ departed from the earth home to His Father. Under this condition alone, He came entirely close to humanity—He became entirely its own. We may stand too near to external objects to see them truly, especially to the forms of the beautiful; we may stand externally too near to men to estimate them entirely, or to appreciate them, especially great men. But Christ must stand face to face with humanity in the remoteness of heaven, in order to grasp it by means of the threefold inwardness of its memory, its hope, and its desire, in the most intimate manner, till He could become altogether present to it by His Spirit.

The result has confirmed the truth of His word. For the first time His Spirit came upon His disciples after His ascension, and then in its fullest streams. And where it has been wished to approach more closely to the Lord in an external manner—where it has been sought to represent Him by official symbols in the phenomenal world, there His Spirit has gradually altogether retreated, until a frightful abandonment of the Spirit has been the consequence. But to the entrance into the heart turned towards Him—to the remembrance associated with His word and His communion, He has always revealed Himself anew as the historical Christ—to the hope, as the future Christ—to the prayerful desire, as the heavenly Christ, who makes Himself known from heaven by His Spirit.

Thus were the disciples to learn to believe in the advantage which the going home of Christ brings to them. Not perhaps

because the Paraclete which He sends to them from the Father would be greater than Christ, but because even Christ first attains His full greatness for them and communicates His full blessing to them by the Paraclete. This He now explains to them.

The Holy Spirit will supply to them in a twofold manner the visible presence of the Lord: first, by granting to them the most glorious protection against the world; then by unveiling to them the riches of the life of Jesus wholly, and making it the property of their inner life.

'And when He is come, He will (through you and for you) reprove the world (thus vanquish and cast down, teachingly and punishingly overcome) in respect of sin, and in respect of righteousness, and in respect of judgment.' Thus, in the most glorious gradation of His victory, He will bring to nought the enmity of the world against the Lord and His disciples.

First of all, He will charge upon the world as sin, *the sin* of not believing on Christ. He will increasingly bring to light the identity between the unbelief and the sin which became so clearly manifest in the crucifixion of Christ—will prove that unbelief against Christ is the great world-historical sin, that of the new apostasy; and therewith it will also become plain, that at all times, according to its innermost nature, unbelief was against the everlasting Christ,—to wit, misconduct against the Logos as the Light which is everywhere in the world, and shines out into the darkness. And thus the whole sin of the world should absolutely be brought to light as the *one sin*, which has been discovered and judged in the crucifixion of Christ.

But how could the Holy Spirit effect this historically great repentance of the world, if it did not at the same time fill the world with the faith in Christ? The knowledge of sin can only be accomplished in the world by the knowledge of Christ. Thus also He will cause righteousness to be recognised in all the world—righteousness simply, as it is opposed to sin simply, as it made itself known in opposition to that concentrated sin which crucified the Son of God, as the concentrated world-historically revealed Righteousness. But He illustrates the perfected revelation of righteousness by revealing anew to the world the whole significance of Christ's ascension to the Father. The return of Christ to the Father is the unveiling and glorification of right-

eousness in its entire glory—of righteousness as it puts to death and makes alive, as it is manifest in Him and upon Him,[1] and illuminates the world through Him like a day of judgment; but as the deliverance of the world, justifies sinners. But as His return to the Father in the abstract developes itself in the three characteristics of His death, His resurrection, and His ascension, so also the revelation of righteousness is threefold. We behold in the death of Jesus the entire destroying power of righteousness. The righteousness of the Father allows the Son to suffer and to die on account of His human and historical fellowship with sinners. And it was actually the faithfulness with which the Son maintained His righteousness in the most fearful temptation that brought Him to death. And this death becomes also the sentence of death upon the blinded world which inflicted it on Him. The Father Himself makes the greatest sacrifice—the Son dies: humanity is judged, and *appears* destroyed. It is the majesty of righteousness in its absolute proceedings against sin. *Death, and nothing but death, from Heaven, even to the abyss!* But therein is established the deliverance of the world. Righteousness proves itself to be righteousness even by remaining one with life and love, and therefore allows life to proceed out of the death which it inflicts. This becomes plain in the resurrection of Christ. His righteousness breaks through death as life, and is revealed in His new life: the righteousness of the Father raises Him up for the sake of His own essential righteousness; after that, for the sake of his connection with the world, it has allowed Him to suffer and to die. But therewith it establishes Him as the righteousness of humanity, as the Head of humanity glorified in judgment, in which all men may find their reconciliation with God. *Thus righteousness appears now as a new life, which goes quickening from heaven even to the abyss.*[2] But once more it expressed itself in a new form in the

[1] The disposition to complete these three great statements about sin—about righteousness—about judgment—by closer definitions, and, *e.g.*, to apprehend the righteousness only as the righteousness of Christ, amounts in this case to a narrowing, and hence to an altering of the simple and grand meaning of the passage. Its precision lies strictly in its *apparent* want of precision.

[2] Comp. Rom. iii. 26. Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. It is a false abstract comprehension of the divine righteousness which sets it in opposition to grace, by ascribing to it merely *destroy-*

ascension of Christ. The ascension is always the comprehension of the death and of the life of Christ in a higher condition, which has taken up and entwined the death into itself; and thus also it is here. The perfecting of Christ's righteousness has His life in glory as its result. He goes as the holy One to the Father; the holy Father separates Him as high as heaven from the sinners, by conferring the reward. But now, first in His glory, He sends to His disciples the Holy Spirit, to fill the world with His righteousness. Thus righteousness prevails now as holiness, killing and making alive, as *sanctifying from the height of heaven down into the depth of the world.* Thus, in proportion as the Holy Spirit unveils the departure of Christ to the world, He discloses to it the great revelation of righteousness.

With these two great effects of the Holy Spirit, the third is already announced. As He calls the world to repentance, and fills it with faith, He leads it also to sanctification, in bringing it over from judgment; He unveils to it the perfected judgment, in showing to it that the prince of this world is judged. As the sin of the world has made itself known in the crucifixion of Christ, and the everlasting righteousness in His return to His Father, both of them in world-historical definiteness and concentration, so in the same sense the judgment of righteousness upon the sin in that centre of the world has become manifest—judgment simply, in its centre. The prince of this world, for instance, is judged in that fact. But that is the judgment—that the completed sin has become spoiled in its completed conflict with perfected righteousness in slaying (as a deed of the whole world) the Son of God, and thus the very image of God Himself, on the cross. Hence, for instance, it has become plain that evil operates upon earth not only as a dismembered and scattered force, but as a dark world-power, whose centre is a diabolical consciousness, which stands behind and above all individual human sins, in the gloomy background of a fallen spirit-kingdom, and, as prince of the world in its corruption, weaves all the threads of evil into one web of enmity against God, and thence especially against the God-man. Moreover, it has be-

ing effects, not also quickening ones. Even the righteousness of God may communicate itself, by making alive; but where there is sin, the *killing* effect must precede. Compare 1 John iii. 7.

come plain that the world is enslaved by this prince—that, ensnared by all its individual sins in his devices, it is enslaved to his service. Finally, moreover, the absolute venomousness of evil has been manifested. Sin, in its actual virulent opposition to God, has been characterized as decided enmity against God, even into all its gloomy elements. And this is, in fact, the judgment of the Spirit. When the prince of this world was unmasked, the world also was unmasked, as it served this prince, and the service with which it was devoted to him. In its world-historical centre, evil was now lighted up and judged. Moreover, it was not only now judged spiritually, but also as a matter of fact, and historically, to wit, by the victory of Christ. By His resurrection were shown the stupidity of the serpent, in the cunning of the serpent; the powerlessness of the evil one, in the power of the evil one; the humiliation of the world, in the pomp of the world. The whole great scheme of the evil one appeared, as it were, metamorphosed into the great furtherance of God's purpose. As well *evil itself, as the evil one and the kingdom of the evil one*, appeared destroyed and made a mockery of. Moreover, the judgment of God which one day is to be revealed at the world's end in the last judgment as a developed and completed phenomenon, is thereby decided according to its historical foundation. The head of the serpent is crushed. It is easy to recognise in the light of Christ's victory, that the tremendous convulsions of its body are not the movements of a powerful life, but the writhings of death, as it is now the work of the Holy Spirit to make the world acquainted with the mystery of this judgment. He delivers men from the distinctive superstition respecting the power of the evil one, from the cowardly torpor caused by the Medusa's head of dark power, which always results in the fall. He fills them with the spirit of victory, which streams forth from the victor and the victory, and thereby leads them up in the way of sanctification to the holiness and the ideality of the new world.

Thus will the promised Spirit of Truth form the relation in which the disciples are to stand *to the world.* The old world is, so to speak, to vanish before the glorious power of the Holy Spirit which will fill them. But this victory of the disciples over the world can only be accomplished by the life of Christ being perfectly opened to them, by His work and the nature of His

kingdom being fully illustrated to them. And this is actually the operation of the Spirit in the relation in *which the disciples stand to Jesus.* First, the Holy Spirit will disclose to them all the fulness of Christ; and by that disclosure He will make them conquerors of the world, but not in such a way as to lead them away from the personality of Christ. In this sense Christ says: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' (The communication of them would transcend your present powers of faith and knowledge.)

Thus, in precise accordance with the will of the Father, He spares them in their weakness; for He has entrusted to them all that the Father has given to Him for them. From the following words of the Lord, probably appears in what consist those lessons which they could not yet bear. He says, 'When the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth.' This points especially, no doubt, to the living developments and applications of the principles which He had already declared to them, especially also to those consequences which, in part, were most decidedly opposed to their previous Jewish presumptions. Even the subsequent history of the disciples shows us how it was especially those consequences with which they first of all needed to be entrusted by the Holy Ghost,[1] and which they could not possibly have comprehended *a priori*, particularly the release of the institution of Christ from the husk of the Israelitish element. But even the Holy Spirit will not tell them all at once. Even as Christ in His instruction proceeds methodically, so also will the Spirit proceed methodically (ὁδηγήσει); and will therefore not disclose to them the whole truth except in gradual development. 'For He shall not speak of Himself,' says Christ, as He has declared this previously of Himself, of the Son. 'But whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak.' This passage is explained by what Christ has said of His own relation to the Father. Thus, as He Himself has only expressed what the Father has communicated to Him, so the Holy Spirit will only declare what the Father speaks through the Son. Thus, whatever is suggested, whatever is expedient, whatever comes with the power of God's word into His sphere, into the circle of the inmost life of the congregation, He will announce and bring to recognition. Nevertheless He will not in any wise allow them

[1] *Vide* Acts i. 6; ch. x. 9.

to remain on an imperfect grade of knowledge; but it is further said, 'He will show you things to come.' He will thus unveil to them in prophetic manner the future developments according to their grand outlines. Thus will the Holy Spirit first of all carry on the work of enlightenment according to the will of the Father, and in relation to Him and to His ministry. With similar precision He will, moreover, secondly refer Himself to the Son, and to His work: 'He will glorify Me,' says Christ; 'for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you.' Thus He will spiritually set forth the nature of Christ in its perfect brightness, by bringing all the words, acts, and impulses of His life into complete development, also by unfolding the depths of the life of humanity and of creation in their relation to the nature of Christ; thus also further disclosing the manifestation of the Christological ideality in the fundamental plan of the world. That Christ in the deeper meaning was thus speaking of His own, is proved by the context: 'For all that the Father hath is Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you.' Thus, also, what is the Father's is the Son's; and this, moreover, is all the Holy Ghost's. But the Holy Ghost makes it the inheritance of the Church of Christ.[1]

As thus this view of the Holy Spirit and His operation is distinct from those which Spiritualism in its most varied forms has constructed for itself, so truly also is it distinct from those which a lifeless doctrine of inspiration has created for itself. Spiritualism, in its forms of religious excitement, in the school of Montanism, in the motive power of the 'Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit,' and in other sects, has always spoken of one period of the Holy Spirit's agency in which His work is to appear more or less severed from that of the Father and of the Son. The relation of the Paraclete, according to Christ's intimation, is altogether otherwise. He operates according to the impulses of the Father, and in perfect accordance with the Son, glorifying His word and work. Still more distinct, moreover, is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, from that spiritual form which the secularized spiritualism celebrates, confounding it altogether without misgiving with the Holy Spirit. This spiritualism reverences the image of the *world-spirit* which, in

[1] 'This is the circle, round, and closed, and compacted—all three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, into one eternal divine Being.'—Luther.

the succession of *time-spirits*, always contradicts itself, always anew abolishes itself, because the time-spirits are only the impulses of the unity of the changing phases of time; while the Holy Spirit remains eternally like Himself, because He is the unity of the manifold impulses of eternity in time—of the revelation of the Father and the Son. Moreover, as pure and immutable as this Spirit is in relation to the Father and the Son, so living is His operation in the apostles; and it is likewise false to suppose, according to any abstract orthodox scholastic conception, that He has all at once expressed everything in all persons in an unconditionally developed inspiration. Certainly it is decidedly declared that the Holy Ghost would communicate to the apostles not only the full revelation according to the necessities of the time present, that He not only would unveil to them the whole riches of the life of Christ, but that He would reveal to them also the form of the Church's future in its great outlines.

In that perfected endowment which the apostles received for their vocation of establishing the Church, the further operations of the Holy Spirit were not superfluously brought to a complete development of revelation. Rather it is here indicated, as the aim of His efficiency, that He will disclose and reveal all the depths of life which belong to the sphere of the Vates, in their relation to the life of Christ, as being His own; then He will carry on to fulfilment the glorification of the world in Christ, and of Christ in the world.

This promise of the perfect glorification of the world, as the Holy Ghost should effect it, in its relation to Christ, entirely corresponds with the complete conquest and destruction of the old world, as He was to effect it in relation to the world. For thus Christ showed to His disciples in what degree He would abide by His Spirit in them *in this life*, while He in His individual ministry would be acting for them *in the world to come*. In this respect the contrast between the present and the future life is for the faithful disciples substantially done away. Their entire future was to be so glorified by the fellowship with Christ, and by the seeing of Christ again, that the brief time of separation from Him which before that glory they were still to undergo, must appear as a small one, as a brief period of tribulation.

This, then, is the view in which the Lord comprehends the

whole consolatory representation of the future which He gave to the disciples in the words, 'A little while, and ye shall not see Me: and again a little while,[1] and ye shall see Me (again); for I go to the Father.'.

To see Him and be with Him—that is even now their happiness and their life: thus He may lay out the picture of their entire future in the contrast between their soon seeing Him no more, and soon thereafter seeing Him again. It is the most lively expression of the fact, that in their relation to Him they would pass through brief sorrows to eternal joys. 'It is yet but a little while, and ye see Me no more.' He thus tells them that they are already drawing near to the great sorrow which begins with the separation from Him, and peculiarly consists in that separation. That they, however, shall *then* see Him no more, is perhaps said with emphasis, just as the following words that they should afterwards see Him again. In the hour of separation from Him, it shall be to them as if they had lost Him, as if He were destroyed, and for them irrevocably gone. Then they should still be connected with Him in their deepest soul only by the power of faith and their love for Him. And yet, moreover, He will not then have passed away—only *their* eyes shall see Him no more. But as quickly as this sad time comes, so quickly it will pass by. Again a little while, and they shall see Him again. And then they were actually to see Him, and in the manner in which they see Him now (in the light of the Spirit), eternally see Him (not, perchance, merely in the interval between Easter and Ascension). The eternal spiritual seeing, again, of Christ, which is appointed for them, will begin with the historical seeing again (in His resurrection), will be ever and anon pervaded by Him (in the death of the individual disciples), will finally be completed in Him (with the future reappearance of Christ). The certainty of both announcements lies in the one assurance, 'for I go to the Father.' His going home to the Father is thus appointed. It will proceed through the periods of the death, of the resurrection, and of the ascension, and be certified in the effusion of the Holy Spirit.

[1] The first μικρόν is like the μικρόν of ch. xiv. 19. It embraces the time from the journey to Gethsemane to the death of Jesus; the second μικρόν indicates the limit from the burial of the Lord to the showing of His resurrection.

Thus would Jesus speak to the disciples by way of consolation; they would now soon have to undergo with Him a sad but brief sorrow, but only to pass over into an endless period of festival and joy. Even at this time, however, He had so chosen His expression, that the disciples were induced to declare their latest offence at His communications. And thus, moreover, they found in fact His new announcement totally unintelligible. Some among them began to dispute with one another about it. What can it mean, it is said, that He says about a little while, and ye shall not see Me: and again a little while, and ye shall Me; and then again, For I go to the Father? First of all, it was enigmatical to them that they were so soon to see Him no more, and what that was to import. Then it was to them still more enigmatic, that they should then after a little while see Him again; and especially they knew not how to reconcile themselves finally to His adding, that 'He was going to the Father.'[1] Speedy going away, and speedy meeting again, and withal, most decided going to the Father, how were they to be enlightened upon this? It was most difficult for them to solve this great riddle in such great haste. Thus they remained, standing astonished, and wondering, 'What is this that He saith, *A little while?*'

How could a man have foreseen that the whole marvellous turn and decision of His and their future would be compressed in the period of three days? This wonder even remains a riddle still to the mind of man entangled with earthly things. He stands overcome before that great catastrophe, and comprehends not that it could come to pass so rapidly and so terribly; that it could bring about the most tremendous crisis; that it could transplant the Lord, and with Him the disciples, yea, the entire human race, first of all into the depth of the abyss, then into the height of heaven. The disciples must have fully undergone and expressed in that hour the doubting astonishment of the human mind upon this problem. They could not get away from the question, What can He mean by this mysterious saying, *A little while?*

In the expression itself lay something which pleased them, and again something which terrified and embarrassed them.

[1] 'The questioners take the enigmatical expression to pieces, and reflectively consider every individual word. At length, in ver. 18, they pause upon the doubled μικρόν as the most difficult.'—Lücke.

They would have liked to ask the Lord what He meant by the expression, and still did not accomplish it. But the Lord saw plainly that they would like to ask Him, and met their wish with the words, 'Do ye inquire among yourselves of that I said, A little while, and ye shall not see Me: and again a little while, and ye shall see Me? Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice; ye shall[1] be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.' The first points to them the great suffering that threatens them in its first vivid form, as opposed to the jubilee of the world; the second expression indicates the same great sorrow in its purer inwardness, as it shall be changed into rejoicing for themselves.[2]

They are thus to know especially, that their sorrow shall indeed be great, but that it shall only endure for a short time; and that it is the inevitable condition under which alone they could arrive at the new position of victorious rejoicing in the kingdom of God—that it is the suffering itself which is to be changed for them into joy.

He now sets forth this truth to them in the beautiful parabolic discourse of the woman in travail. 'The woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour (the definite moment of peril) is come: but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more her anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world.' He shows to them thus that their sorrows are the birth-pains of the new era, which they must undergo with Him. The great joy of the new period will swallow up the affliction of their pains. The woman in this parable refers to the heavenly or ideal Church; still more the man who is born into the world, to the risen Lord, in whom the beginning of the new æon—the first-born from the dead,[2] the principle of the divine-human glorification of humanity and of the world—is given to humanity.

The Lord Himself gives to His parable a practical explanation, as the disciples are now in need of it: 'And ye now there-

[1] According to Lachmann, ὑμεῖς λυπηθήσεσθε, without the connecting δέ, which is found in the usual reading.

[2] 'As soon as the glory of Christ begins to reveal itself, there arises for the world the painful ἔλεγχος of the Spirit. It can, if it believes, take part in the joy of the disciples of Jesus; but, so long as it remains the world, it will not. But this aspect of the subject is not carried on.'—Lücke.

[3] See Col. i. 18, 19.

fore have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.' That is the first fruit of this glorious meeting again,—imperishable effect, imperishable joy. The second is this—they shall then have the most satisfying disclosure of all that which now is still enigmatical to them. 'And in that day,' says the Lord, 'ye shall ask Me nothing.'

A short time previously, He had reproached them that they did not ask Him (in the right sense) whither He was going. Still *in their own fashion* they have asked Him much;—Peter and Thomas, Philip and Judas, Lebbæus, at last all of them together. But soon, says He, it shall be entirely otherwise with them: they shall have full explanation; they shall no more in this grievous way find everywhere in His words and ways such difficulty, enigmas, and hindrance. In this He promised them complete enlightenment about Himself and the course of His life. But they would not probably be enlightened about Him as about a foreign subject passively; they themselves must be thoroughly drawn into the fellowship of His new life. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you,' thus runs His promise, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you.' He commends to them the significance of this word, by adding, 'Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name.' They have not yet attained to the simple knowledge of His essential character, still less to resignation to Him, and thus also not to the pure interest for Him and His work, out of which proceeds the simple prayer in His strength. They could not then stand and pray in His name, until that name was wholly glorified by His Spirit, as it had expressed itself in word and life, and as it was further to express itself in death and resurrection, and until they in that name had themselves died and become alive again; but then the whole wish of their whole inward life, the entire fulfilment of the entire petition, was moreover secured to them. 'Then ask,' He exhorts them, 'and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.'

It is deeply to be considered how pointedly the Lord, before His departure, exhorted the disciples to seek for themselves the pentecostal blessing of the Spirit. It is not to be denied that He has here this blessing in view again, and promises it to them, and that this promise is to Him of the like significance with that

of the seeing them again. He refers also, in any case, to the external seeing again by the disciples after the resurrection, in its connection with the spiritual one, which should be fulfilled by the mission of the Holy Spirit. He describes the effect of this seeing again, as the attainment of an imperishable perfect joy that should not be taken from them. They should have the spring of joy in themselves, the everlasting power of an eternal festal exaltation of soul, and elevation of life with God the Holy Ghost. This spirit will then enable them to dispense with the external association with Christ in a twofold manner, by bringing about for them an eternal meeting again with Christ in the Spirit. First, as the Spirit of enlightenment: they shall have a clear understanding about Him; they shall understand the individual impulses of His life, of His words and works, in the living unity of His nature and ministry in His Spirit. The Spirit will interpret everything to them, unfold everything. But, moreover, as the Spirit of the power of faith, He will unite them with Christ. They shall not stand *outside* the power of Christ's name, but in it; therefore in the power of prayer, and in the might of God, who grants their prayer.

In this place, He casts a look back on His previous intercourse with them, and shows them how His future association with them would be distinguished from it:[1] '(All) these things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you in plain immediate speech of the Father.' All intercourse between men, in which the simple interposition of the divine Spirit is wanting, is an intercourse in words of the manner of a similitude, or even in proverbial expressions.[2] This was pecu-

[1] 'It is plain that the dear Lord loved to speak with the disciples in the last hour, and did not like to leave them in sadness about His separation from them. Therefore He uses so many words, makes a conclusion as if He had done speaking, and still begins again, as people do who dearly love one another and must separate, and nevertheless continue to talk, and bid good-night again and again.'—Luther.

[2] The entire speech is a great παροιμία, as long as the Spirit does not explain it; *proverbial saying*, so far as it is identified with the *usual* modes of representation; *figurative expression*, so far as its figuration of the immortality of the spiritual relations is not adequate; *enigmatical expression*, so far as the difference of the manner of thought between the speaker and the hearer darkens and conceals the meaning of the words.

liarly the case, therefore, between Christ and His disciples before their enlightenment by the Holy Spirit. Although He did not speak to them in parables, as He did to the people, yet still He spoke in words of a parabolic kind. Thus even at the last He spoke to them of His death as a departure to prepare for them a dwelling in the Father's house; likened their relation to Him to that of the branch to the vine; showed them the suffering which awaited them by the sorrow of a woman in travail. Nay, even although He spoke to them in words without a figure, yet the word acquired a figurative covering and restriction, even in the dim medium of their comprehension, as the sun's ray becomes coloured in the darkened atmosphere. But now this is to be changed. In the day of His return in the Spirit, He will speak with them in the heart itself, in the full plainness, immediateness, and unveiledness in which spirit speaks to spirit. They shall not be any more embarrassed in the figure, in the fragmentary knowledge, but shall always perceive in the individual the whole, the infinite. Thus He will entirely fulfil to them then the knowledge of the Father which He brought them; the deep, beautiful, blessed heavenly secret of His Father's name He will entirely reveal to them. And as He shall stand to them, so they shall stand to Him. He can say to them with certainty, 'In that day ye shall ask in My name.' He adds, 'And I say not, that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father Himself loveth you.' Herein lies certainly the assurance of His intercession for them, but at the same time the assurance that His intercession is not to be regarded as an external work of mediation (external to the Father and to them), but as an affection of His life for them, wherein the living affection of the Father made itself known to them, and which impressed itself on their own inmost life's affection. His intercession for them should one day appear to them entirely as a manifestation of the Father's love to them, as it is declared in their own love by their praying to the Father in the name of Christ.

Similarly also He will speak to them in their heart by the Holy Spirit, in such a way as if the Father Himself spoke to them immediately; they should speak in His name, and in the blessing of His intercession, so powerfully to the Father, as if they were speaking immediately to the Father. The revelation of the Spirit in their heart will thus not merely complete the

revelation of Christ in them, but through this also the revelation of the Father.

'For,' He says now by way of explanation, 'the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved Me (have grown to love Me), and have believed that I came out from God.' Their love to Him was expressed in their recognition of the divine lineaments in Christ, by faith. But their love to Him is a love for the Father; for it is a love of the divine origin—of the divine nature—of the features of the Father in Him. Even still more is their love for the Father a love of the Father to them; for they would not have known Him by His lineaments in the Son, if He had not lovingly beheld and enlightened them—if He had not made Himself known to them. Therefore it is, moreover, pledged to them, that the Father will fully reveal Himself in their heart by His Spirit.

In the last word to the disciples, 'And ye have believed that I came out from God,' Jesus expressed the entire advantage that resulted from their previous intercourse with Him. To this benefit of their foregone discipleship was to be linked, moreover, the benefit of their future experience, that they should learn to understand His going home to the Father. Therefore He now addresses Himself to their thoughtfulness with an expression which contains the watchword of His whole life: '*I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.*'

From the certainty which they already possess, that He came forth from the Father, they must go on to learn, that He can only go to the Father again if He goes away. And the higher the import of the word rises, that He was with the Father, the more fully is unfolded to them the significance of the saying, that He shall be with the Father. And further, if they knew what a descent into the depth was involved in His going out from the Father and coming into the world, it will also be plain to them what an exaltation it must be when He now soon departs from them to the Father. Yes, this going home to the Father itself appears to them all the more essential, in proportion to their being penetrated with the knowledge, that His present and previous position in the world was not in accordance with His actual glory. And if, finally, they could consider His going forth from the Father into the world not as a purposeless work,

but as a heroic undertaking to deliver the world, His return home to the Father may appear to them only as the progress of the victor, who leads back with Him to the Father in His Spirit them and the world (the substantial God-beloved world) out of the world (the form of worldliness).

Thus, in the same degree as they understood, with faith full of anticipation, the first passage, *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world*, a wonderful clearness must needs spread itself for them over the second. *Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.*

And thus in fact it happened. A bright beam of light poured, with the Lord's last word, through the soul of His disciples—the first flush of the dawning which announced the day that the Easter sun would bring. Overjoyed, they cried out, 'So now speakest Thou in this direct manner—no more in proverbs.' Thus they certainly describe a powerful impression—a distinct presentiment of the future of the Spirit. They add, 'Now are we sure that Thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask Thee' (should first propose to Thee this question). It has been supposed[1] that the disciples had misunderstood the announcement of Jesus, that they should one day have no need to ask Him. This supposition originates probably in a mistake of the characteristic point. The disciples were standing just on the last mountain-peak of the *growing* knowledge of Christ, as it preceded their perfect enlightenment. They now believe so heartily in the word of His promise, that it is to them as if it were already beginning to be fulfilled. They have attained to this point in a twofold manner: first, by the Lord's drawing forth their question before they had proposed it to Him, and by His thus entirely seeing through their inmost mind; and then by His giving to them, by His watchword, a disclosure which shed abroad a bright light in their soul, and gave them the first clear view of the significance of His going home to the Father. Therefore they say that they already perceived that it would come to pass as He had said. Already His last address must be such a word of immediateness (of the Spirit), so really He has advanced them. Even already they were sure that He knew all things. And if He has promised them that they would soon need no more to ask Him, they

[1] See Lücke, ii. 663.

observe to Him, that also on His side there is no need first of all to hear the question—that He anticipates, with His all-comprehending spiritual glance, the questioning minds, and gives to them unasked the desired information. Their answer is immediately to be referred to the announcement of Jesus—One day ye shall have no need to ask Me anything. By a beautiful turn they say, Even already Thou needest not that the question should be proposed to Thee. The expression has the charm of that enthusiastic feeling which graced the words of Nathanael, who immediately, upon the testimony of Christ, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!—broke forth into the words, Rabbi, Thou art the King of Israel!

They manifest that they have perfectly understood His last expression, by the word, Herein is our faith established, that Thou camest forth from God. They thus confirm the fact, that this starting-point of their faith which His coming was to illustrate to them, was actually established as He had said. The Lord made use of this moment to say to them the saddest thing that He still had to tell them, the rather that they were overvaluing the importance of their disposition, and were expressing themselves as if they already stood on the summit of the promised enlightenment: '*Now* ye believe.' He cried to them (*now*, as if He would say, There is to you a fair but fleeting moment of the blooming of faith), 'Behold, the hour cometh, and is now already come, that ye shall be scattered every one to His own concerns;' that is, that every one shall be broken loose, according to that which is sinful and self-seeking in the character of his own individuality, away from the head and from the members, into some peculiar mode of despondency. This scattering tendency is displayed most vividly later in their flight, in the denial of Peter, in the going apart of Thomas, in the solitary journeys of the female and male disciples to the grave, and in the lonely walk of the two disciples who went to Emmaus.

'Ye shall be scattered, every man to his own,' said He; and added, with deep significance, 'and shall leave Me alone.'[1] But, comforting them, He gave them the assurance, 'And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me.'

According to the Synoptists, He carried this statement further. Thus, as He predicted to Judas that he should betray

[1] Compare Isa. lxiii.

Him, as he received the sop from His hand with the hypocritical question, Is it I? (am I the traitor?), which ought to have been an assurance of innocence,—as He announced to Peter his fall, when he was protesting that he would go with Him to death,—so He foretold to the disciples their faithless flight, just as they had believed, in their bright presentiment of the new pentecostal time, that they had already past beyond all difficulties.

'All ye,' said He, 'shall be offended because of Me this night;' that is to say, none of you will entirely endure the temptation of seeing Me in this night so apparently helpless and undone. Every one will waver in faith, and will more or less be shaken by unbelief. This was not only certain to Him by His glimpse into the circumstances, but also by His knowledge of Scripture; 'for it is written,' said He, 'I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.' That portion of Scripture in the prophet Zechariah (xiii. 7) to which the Lord refers, is not quoted literally, but in free recollection. Moreover, it points not merely in typical prefiguration, but with definite prophetic consciousness, forward into the days of the Messiah,—namely, into the days wherein in Jerusalem a fountain should be opened for sin and unrighteousness, and when not only the idols, but also the false prophets and impure spirits, should be removed out of the land,—thus to the days of the completed revelation.[1]

He then declares plainly, that in this manner they shall be scattered from Him in consequence of a feeble-faithed wavering in their hearts. Yet He still gives them the promise, that in this temptation they shall not wholly be ruined; He will gather

[1] The prophet hears in the Spirit how Jehovah summons the sword to come upon the man of His fellowship, to smite the Shepherd that the flock may be scattered. Here every expression is eminently characteristic: the sword in its generality indicating the worldly power in its judicial operation; the man of Jehovah's fellowship indicating His Elected One; the Shepherd absolutely, and the flock absolutely, signifying the Messiah and the people of God; the scattering of the sheep of the flock intimating in general, and chiefly, the separation of the godly of the disciples connected with the Shepherd in the external theocratic Church. That Jehovah could not decree the sword upon an actual גֶּבֶר עֲמִיתִי, as Hitzig supposes (*die Kl. Propheten*, 153), is an assumption that has no foundation either in the prophets (Isa. lxii.) or in the actual history.

them again. 'After My resurrection,' He says, 'I will go before you into Galilee.' In the notion that this announcement does not agree with the narrative that Jesus first of all revealed Himself to the disciples after His resurrection in Judea,[1] is involved an oversight of the leading thought of this announcement. Here, for instance, the Lord promises that after His resurrection He will gather together again His scattered people in Galilee; and, in fact, that happened in Galilee. That the disciples, moreover, were to tarry at Jerusalem till after the publication of His resurrection, is distinctly declared in the assertion, that *after* His resurrection He would *go before* them into Galilee.

The disciples, however, agreed to the disheartening announcement of Jesus, that they would all be offended in Him, just as little as Peter had acquiesced in the shameful disclosure of what would happen to him. They protested that they would hold by Him even to death (Mark xiv. 31). Moreover, it appears that they were induced and stimulated thereto by renewed assurances of fidelity on the part of Peter, by the definite form of the recorded word of Peter: 'Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended.' Still more plainly does this appear from the narrative of Mark (ver. 31), according to which Peter protested so stedfastly and repeatedly that he would not deny the Master, that he was ready to go with Him to death, after He had already announced to him distinctly his fall.

Finally, the Lord comprehended all that He had spoken to the disciples by way of consolation and warning, into the word, 'These things have I spoken unto you, that in Me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

Immediately, and in future times generally, there were impending over them great afflictions in the world; nevertheless, they were to have peace by losing themselves in Him. Moreover, they were to stimulate the consciousness of this peace in themselves, in order to lift themselves courageously above the suffering of the world, to break through the suffering of the world. And how were they to stimulate this consciousness in themselves? By their sympathy with the certainty of His

[1] *Vide* Strauss, ii. 589.

consciousness that He is the overcomer of the world; that He has already actually, in the sphere of the Spirit, overcome the world, by the assertion of His eternal purity, of His perfect divine consciousness as opposed to its endless self-darkening (the representative of which had withstood Him bodily in the person of Judas, and had gone forth into the night before the power of His Spirit); that He would confirm in His departure the peace attained by this victory—would realize it in their necessities, and would extend it through the whole world.

After the Lord had concluded His address to the disciples, He looked up to heaven, and addressed the Father in a prayer which may well be called the high-priestly prayer, since it is wholly inspired by the spirit of sacrifice to the Father. With the full certainty of victory which He had announced to the disciples, but also in the presentiment of the suffering of the world, which now was impending over His disciples, and first of all over Himself, He said, 'Father, the hour is come.' He then commended to Him His own life and ministry, the life and ministry of the disciples, and the salvation of His future Church, in an earnestness of entreaty, in a depth and vividness of representation, which proves that the whole work of the glorification of the world presented itself to His soul as a work decided before God by His victory. First of all He committed to the Father His own life (vers. 1–8).

'Glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may also glorify Thee: as Thou hast given Him power over all flesh, that He should give eternal life to the entire community which Thou hast given Him. And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent. I have *glorified Thee* on the *earth:* I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee (in Thy heaven) before the world was. I have manifested Thy name unto the men whom Thou gavest Me out of the world: Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me; and they have kept Thy word (have apprehended it to keep it). Now they have known that all things, whatsoever Thou hast given Me, are of Thee: for I have given them the words which Thou gavest Me; and they have received them, and have known surely that

I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me.'

This is His first entreaty, that the Father would now make it manifest, let it appear, that, in the power of His Spirit, He is the pervading principle, the Prince of all life,—that His spiritual glory is the principle of the spiritual glorification of the world, of its sanctification and ideality. But He only craves this in order to manifest that the Father (in Him), in the power of His Spirit, rules over and pervades everything. This glorification is founded on the fact that the Father has given Him *à priori* power over all flesh, in that He created in Him, and for Him, humanity and the world; but that especially He has given Him a community which was to be unfolded out of its generality (πᾶν) into a Church of individually defined believers (δώσῃ αὐτοῖς, etc.), in that He bestows upon them everlasting life. And His glorification was to be developed, and with it the glorification of the Father, in the fact that these chosen ones receive everlasting life. If they themselves become, through Christ in His Spirit, possessors of their own life, and joyous, free from the world,—lords over nature, assured in God of immortality, a people of kings and priests, who are leading back the earth into the ideality of the kingdom of God, and still all united under Christ the Head,—it is evident that He is the King of Glory, that through Him the Father governs the world.

But it is primarily manifest by the kind and manner of the foundation of their eternal life in God and in Christ. Their spiritual power and blessedness proceed from the living knowledge that the Father of their Lord Jesus Christ is the only and essential God. Thus, also, through all their spiritual power, world-renewing energy and blessedness, He is revealed as the only and essential God, whose glory shows forth all other false images of God—world-spirit notions—attempts at creature deification—as empty phantasms and larvæ. And since the glorification of the Father is only brought about by the glorification of the Son, the knowledge, also, that He also is an essential God, must proceed from the knowledge that Jesus, the sent of God, is both in one, *the Jesus and the Christ*,[1] *the Son of man and the*

[1] The emphasis lies in *both* the designations, and in the *unity of both*. John, in all probability, had this ground-thought of his theology from the mouth of Jesus Himself.

Son of God, and therefore the everlasting Prophet, Priest, and King of humanity; and as the former knowledge was the glorification of the Father, so this is the glorification of the Son. But both these facts of knowledge are, according to their nature, one—the one harmony of the one eternal life, in which the living Christ, exalted above the world, testifies of the Christ that liveth and ruleth over the world of God—that liveth and pervadeth the world.

Thus Christ indicated the purpose of His entire mission. The God who pervades the whole world in spiritual glory, as He has founded and completed His work in His express image, must be revealed in the free, world-conquering, spiritual life of His people. We now therefore perceive how far this work of Christ is already perfected, and how far it still remains to be perfected.

He glorified the Father upon the earth, in discharging the mission of His pilgrimage upon earth—in substantially completing His whole eternal work—to wit, by having revealed His name to the elect, whom the Father took out of the world and led to Him (John vi. 44). That is the process of their development. They were the Father's (in the special sense in which the elect are His, in the higher tendency of their spiritual life, which is a tendency of the Father to the Son); but the Father brought them to the Son and gave them to Him, by leading them according to the dim but higher impulse of their life, which attained its end in faith in Christ. Moreover, that they were given to Him, is proved by their having kept His word, as the Word of the Father in its divine accuracy and brightness. Consequently they arrived at first at the manifold knowledge, that the acts and words of Christ are from God. They allowed themselves to be penetrated and filled with the divine operation of this testimony of God, as Christ was perfectly the medium of it to them. Finally, also, these facts of knowledge resulted in the light of the one knowledge, that Christ went out from the Father, and was sent by the Father.

This is the present position of the disciples. But Christ has thereby perfected His work in them, and consequently as to its foundation in the world. He has made it a living certainty and experience of humanity, that the Father in heaven, as the living God, has revealed Himself through Him in the world. He has made Himself known to them—He has chosen in them

for Himself *organs* by His word to represent the whole world as pervaded by Him as a kingdom of His Spirit. The Father is glorified upon earth, fundamentally, as far as the work of Christ is completed. But now must this seed be developed in the glorification of the Son in heaven with the Father. First of all, the Father must of Himself approve Him, as the power of the Spirit, which has power over all things, by bringing Him through death to the resurrection. Then He further glorifies Him with Himself, by proclaiming Him as the Prince of Life, who has overcome the whole world, enlightening, reconciling, and sanctifying it by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from Him, and abides still with Him (so far as He enters into those to whom His name is glorified). Moreover, He carries through and completes His glorification by perfectly revealing, from the deep ground of His life, formed through the renewing of the world in His Spirit, the glory which Christ already had with Him before the foundation of the world—by thus also bringing out into manifestation the ideality which forms the ground-plan of the world in its relation to the Son in a spiritually glorified world. This is the next entreaty of Christ, in which His necessity is one with that of the disciples, and with which He passes on to the intercession for the disciples (vers. 9–19): 'I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given me; for they are Thine. And all Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine. And I am glorified in them, and I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy name in which (ᾧ) Thou hast given them Me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in Thy name: those that Thou gavest me I preserved, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled. And now come I to Thee; and these things I speak in the world (as departing, and as it were, calling back a last word to the world), that they might have My joy as the perfected joy of their inner life. I have given them Thy word; and the world hateth them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them in the truth: Thy word is the truth. As Thou

hast sent Me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified in the truth.'

Christ prays, then, for His disciples, but not for the world. Thus He expresses the power of the solicitude with which He commends the disciples to God. As in the first part He Himself is more than the world, and for that very reason Reconciler of the world; thus, in the second part, His apostles, as the bearers of the entirety of His life, have a purely incalculable value. If they are saved, the deliverance of the world is secured; He declares that in the strongest manner. And so far His word is an assertion that He would not now pray for the world, because the security of this His apostolic Church was His care before the Father, prior to that of millions besides. But He does not pray generally for the world, inasmuch as He here understands by the world the old worldly form, which is already overcome and judged with its prince, but out of which all who are given to Him by the Father are delivered. He knows certainly that for these disciples He prays effectually. Because they are His, they are the Father's also; and therefore they shall be kept faithful.

But because they are the Father's, they are also His; and this is the circumstance on account of which He must earnestly pray for them. They are His, for His name is already glorified in them as well as the Father's. They have acknowledged Him as the Lord of glory. But precisely on that account they stand in greater peril. And not only they are threatened, but also His work in them.

They bear His name and His work in their heart, but in great weakness. And yet He can do nothing more in the world for them henceforth; that is to say, nothing to supply His place to them by others, to strengthen them, because He is no more in the world. The word is to be understood in a peculiar meaning; it is explained by the connection. Christ has already concluded His work in the world, as He formerly established it. He can thus no longer extend His institution. He must rather consider the disciples, or the fact that He is glorified in them, as the clear result of His ministry. Thus, when they are threatened, His work is threatened; moreover, if His work is threatened, it is they, and, in them, humanity, which is imperilled.

And they are remaining behind in the world, in all the

dangers of the world, while He goes home to the Father. The deepest sentiment is expressed in this contrast; this is plain from the exclamation of Jesus in imploring intercession: Holy Father, keep them!

He here cries to the Father as to the Holy One, because He is the source of all brightness and purity, as opposed to all the self-complication and darkness of the world, and who accordingly, also, sanctifying His disciples, and lifting them up into His own brightness, keeps them from the magical spirits of error in the world.

The preserving power, however, lies in the name of the Father. As long as men know the Father in truth, they are children. If, however, the name of the Father is confused and darkened to them, if it is distorted in them by the falsehood of the world, degraded and dissolved into the apparent names of other divinities, then they are no more children. In that illumination of the name of Father for them, as it is one with the truth,[1] it happened that they also acknowledged the name of Christ, that they were given to Him. And the keeping of the disciples of Jesus will be attested by their remaining One. The measure of their disunion is the measure of their danger, and of the darkening of their clear recognition of the name of the Father. But the oneness is not the means of their acknowledgment of the name of Father; but the preservation in the name of the Father is the means of their being one. Thence, before all things, their unity is the important point in the foundation, from the foundation, and for the foundation of their salvation; whereby unity in appearance may in many ways be obscured, while an external appearance of unity is able to hide the most fearful abysses of disunion in relation to the acknowledgment of the one name. That is the test of the true agreement: they are to be one, as the Father and Son. Not only so essentially, so freely, so lovingly, so perfectly one; but equally also so personally one, that the contrast and difference of the personal is not defaced, but glorified by the unity. Thereupon is the true church-unity of the disciples to be acknowledged, that it entirely depends upon liberty, subsists in the Spirit, makes itself known in love, and glorifies the associated individuals without losing sight of their individuality.

This essential oneness of the Church of Christ, however, is

[1] Compare ver. 11 with vers. 15–17.

the proof that it is based in the name of the Father, in the brightness of the fundamental view of His revelation in Christ; and that it is therewith delivered and protected in its opposition to the corruption of the world, which has its origin in the self-darkening of the world, especially in relation to the true knowledge of the name of God. The essential *confession* will always be the characteristic sign of the Church of Christ, in contrast with the essential *confusion* which is the characteristic sign of the world.

The word of Jesus becomes now that of most earnest intercession, as He declares that henceforth the disciples need a new form of divine protection. For so long as He was with them, He kept them; yes, faithfully protected them, as a shepherd his flock, so that none of them is lost, except the child of perdition. What an assurance! Yet the flight of the disciples was impending, the fall of Peter, and all the doubt of Thomas. Nevertheless, the Master knows that in the impending temptation the entire company will not be lost. And thus, likewise, it is imminent that Judas, in the pangs of despair, will curse his treachery. Nevertheless, Christ knows that he goes thereby into immeasurable perdition. He names him, in this foresight which is associated with the piercing glance into his heart of hearts, *the child of perdition*, possibly with reference to the children of perdition which, in the prophet Isaiah (lvii. 4),[1] are opposed to the righteous man (ver. 1), who, indeed, also perishes, but comes to peace in his chamber. They are traitors to the righteous man (vers. 4, 5), servants of Moloch, offering (ver. 5) their evil sacrifices 'in the valleys under the clifts of the rocks.' Their form, however, is changed gradually in the view of the prophet into the form of one individual,[2] who has his portion and perishes in the rocky valley on the stream (ver. 6), of a lover of the world (ver. 7), of a restless one (ver. 10), of a crafty one (ver. 11), who however is unmasked (ver. 12), and at length perishes in his despair without deliverance (vers. 12, 13). To this last text the declaration of Jesus probably refers, that Judas perished according to the Scripture.[3] For here in the prophet the image

[1] As τέκνα ἀπωλείας—σπέρμα ἄνομον.

[2] Originally of the apostate people.

[3] Lücke refers this word (678) to the text, Ps. xli. 10, with reference to chap. xiii. 18, and brings forth the ground-thought, that, according to

of the traitors to the sacred cause of the theocracy was delineated even with the highest energy, even to individualizing them; therefore the passage was a type which found in Judas its last and highest fulfilment. And thus also in this point the Scripture must be fulfilled, not as a fatalistic foretelling of that which is still uncertain, but as the design completed with divine foresight of an operation which must attain in the evil, as in the good, its highest point.

But the certainty of the Lord, that He till now has securely kept the company of His disciples, with the exception of Judas, does not exclude His anxiety for their future. He looked through the danger which would arise for them from the circumstance, that for the future they must stand alone. But as He now must depart from them, He could not only by His intercession, in their presence (while still speaking in the world), commit them to the Father, but also animate them to the belief, that to them, the perfect joy of His own heart, the Holy Spirit should be communicated. This is generally the preservation which He desires for them. Then He declares Himself more definitely. First of all, on the danger which they were encountering. Precisely because He has given them the word from the Father, they are hated by the world. The world, as the kingdom of self-confusion, hates the Lord, as the Prince of world-enlightenment; therefore hates His disciples also, who have taken up into themselves the principle of that brightness and glorification, (and are not of the world). But hatred is essentially the negation of love, and of the clearness that is in it; it is a principle of obscuration, and seeks to draw those who love into its dark circle, by the magical inbreathing of obscurity. Nevertheless Christ cannot ask that God would take them out of the world. He will neither have His disciples freed from the world by death, nor through a monkish, world-forsaking disposition. It is His desire that they should remain in the world, in the relations of this present life, but that the Father should keep them from the evil which rules the world.

'They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.'

the arrangement of the righteousness of God in the world by reason of sin, 'even in the holiest company is one traitor.' But this thought has already been fulfilled in the reference of the moment of John xiii. 18 to Ps. xli. 10. But here what is spoken of is the perdition of that traitor.

For the first time Christ expressed this fact, to explain the hatred of the world against His disciples. For the second time, on the other hand, He declares it, to explain His assurance that the Father would keep them. Moreover, they were to be kept for this reason, that living *in the world,* they are for evermore separated from the world. This is plain from the petition, Sanctify them in Thy truth. This it is which was to distinguish and separate, and thus to *sanctify* them from the world, which was to lead them back into their eternal original relation to God through Christ, as the ideality of their life—not the Levitical separation, not the priestly garment, not office, not pious seeming, not external hypocrisy, but the truth, the breaking through of the everlasting determination and operation of God, through the illusions and seeming relations of their life. But the heart and soul of this efficiency of the truth, or of the truth of the efficiency, is the word of God, which Christ has given to them—the name of the Father. Thus they must be sanctified therein. Whilst they were thus inwardly being ever separated from the ungodly nature of the world by the word of God, they were constantly most deeply to enter externally into the world with this word, in order to deliver the world itself from worldliness. Nay, Christ will send them into the world as decidedly, as definitely, and with as full power, as the Father sent Him into the world. But that this mission might be possible, He sanctifies Himself for them, that they also might be sanctified in the truth. But how can the Holy One sanctify Himself anew, except through going home to the Father (by death, resurrection, and ascension),—leaving the world, and going to the Father, and appearing in the holiest of all for them? (Heb. ix. 24). Only by Christ's going out of the world to the Father is the work of reconciliation completed, and the Spirit purchased, in whose power the disciples might go out into the world deeply, with an apparently opposite direction. They must in Christ have their fulcrum at the throne of God, in order thus to lift the world from its centres. The real externally perfected sanctification of the inwardly holy (making unworldly), is the condition under which those who are not yet even inwardly sanctified, may become, by their fellowship with Him, holy in their connection with the world. For by this relation they attain, by the Spirit of truth, life in the truth, which Christ has committed to them

in His word; but the truth sanctifies man because it brings him back out of the seeming relations into the essential relations of his life.

As Christ, then, sends forth His people into the world as sanctified bearers of His life, it is plain that He desires the sanctification of the world. Thus, therefore, is introduced His intercession for those who are still in the world, but are appointed to become His disciples (20–24).

'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us:[1] that the *world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.* And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that *the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me.* Father, I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me: for Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world.'

This intercession forms a definite progression in these petitions, in which Christ, pressing forward, requests greater and greater things for humanity from God the Father.

He prays, first of all, for those who believe through the word of His apostles. They were all to be *one* by faith. *All;* and indeed as the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, thus were they to be in the Son and in the Father, and by that means one. They were not only to be in the Son, but also in the Father—not only in the Father, but also in the Son; so that the Father and the Son reveal themselves through them in their unity, or glorifying power, which moves the world. This is the perfect unity of all Christians, consistent with perfect freedom and distinctness of individualities (in that all are as definitely stamped as the personality of the Father in that of the Son,

[1] The passage is more significant if, with Lachmann, according to important authorities, we reject the ἕν. First of all it was said, *that* believers should be one; then it is said, *how?* For instance, as the Father is in Christ, and Christ in the Father, so were they also to be in them (in the Father and the Son), *and by that means* one. This may be characterized as the Johannic Catholicism.

and the reverse). Thus they were to form a glorious, universal, and free Church,—a divine marvel, which constrains the whole of the rest of the world to the belief that Jesus came from the Father.

In the second petition Christ declares that He has committed to His disciples His spiritual power which the Father gave Him. He will so fill them with His Spirit, that they shall be perfected, and therewith perfectly *one*. The effect of such a manifestation of the royal-priestly people, however, should be that the world not only believes but acknowledges, and not only acknowledges that the Father hath sent Christ, but also that He loves believers even as He loves Christ. In this the glory of the people of Christ has produced a yet much greater effect on the world.

Still more powerful and comprehensive is the expression of Christ's petition at the third stage. In the consciousness of oneness with the Father, He says, Father, I will. As assured as is His will in God, so certain also is this, that His disciples shall one day be where He is, with Him in His heavenly kingdom. It was to be the aim of their life to see His glory which the Father gave Him, in which He already before the foundation of the world looked upon Him and loved Him in His eternal nature. The glory of Christ is also to be manifested, and be the centre as the unity of a phenomenal world filled with that manifestation; and the contemplation of this glory shall be the perfected blessedness of perfected Christians. They shall see God in the glory of the Son.

The first petition refers to the believing Church, which has it in charge continually to realize the unity in Christ; and still continually to convince the world that actually Christ their Head is from God. A powerful world is opposed to it. It prays for the glorification of the Church in its unity, and has entirely the character of petition. The second refers to the Church, as in the character of Church of the kingdom it shall abide to the end of the world, mightily filled with Christ—so that every one determines himself in the spirit of Christ Himself, free and spiritually strong—all of them His likeness; so that the world that still opposes itself, is startled by the contemplation, All these are beloved of God, and God's heroes, images of Christ. This second petition is based upon the character of the promise (δέδωκα αὐτοῖς). The third petition finally refers to the relation of the

people of Christ to Him in the kingdom of glory. It is not put forward in the form of a prayer, because the blessedness proceeds as a certain result from the preservation and confirmation of the faithful. It has therefore the air of prophecy. Here the world—which withstood the Church, as being in the first stage interfered with; in the second, as altogether startled by it—has entirely disappeared from the sphere of vision; only a slight notion of the contrast returns in the word, Thou hast loved Me before the foundation of the world. But here He shows us the world as it is in the light of its foundation, which it has from God; no more in the twilight of its perishableness, which it gave to itself. Even in its foundation, or in its substantial nature, it undoubtedly forms a contrast to Christ; but this contrast is no hostile one; it only expresses the fact that Christ is the living principle of the created world, but that it extends itself before Him and beneath Him into an immeasurable region, which is appointed in endlessly varied degrees to declare and to set forth His glory.

That was the destination of the world. And yet the world is thus wholly changed, wholly estranged from its purpose. This contrast touches the Lord's heart in its full power, and the feeling of it expresses itself in the close of His prayer:

'O righteous Father, and thus (even) the world[1] hath not known Thee: but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me. And I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them.'

The expression, 'righteous Father,' is in its entire precision to

[1] There must certainly be in this place a reference back (although it is disputed by Tholuck) to the words καταβολὴ κόσμου in the preceding passage, even although 'κόσμος is here used in an ethical, and there in a physical sense.' For in any case there is a relation between the fact that the Father loved Christ before the foundation of the world, and that Christ has acknowledged Him in the world. The same relation must, however, subsist between the fact that the world in its physical form (as substantial) was subordinate in the love of God to the Son; and the manifestation that now (as ethical in its self-frustration) it has not known God. It is a moral relation, as between the servant who has only one pound and the fact that he buries it in the earth, in contrast with the servant who has the ten pounds and gains ten pounds. The relation indicated, however, is in no way fatalistic. This appears for the most part from the freedom of the life of Christ; here also, from the fact that Christ calls on the Father as the Righteous One, with reference to this circumstance.

be maintained. Nay, the seldomer it appears, the greater is here its emphasis, its significance. It expresses at first probably the presentiment of Christ, that He must now experience the full reality of the righteousness of God in His life, as He acknowledges Him in His Spirit. This experience is actually formed out of the contradiction involved in the world's ignorance of the Father, and His knowledge of Him. The world knows not the Father, not even as the Righteous One, although the righteousness of God is actually purposing to express it to it in the heaviest judgment. But Christ knows the Father—He knows Him even as the Righteous One—just because He is one with Him in His love; therefore He experiences in His heart the judgment of God upon the world for the salvation of the world. In the power of His divine feeling, He is able to combine the expressions, righteous, and Father!—expressions which the worldly-entangled mind is not in a position to comprehend together without the first melting into the second, or the second into the first, in its acceptation. In the judgment of God upon the world, He can acknowledge, greet, experience, comprehend, and attain the reconciliation of the world. Moreover, thus He can also expect of the righteousness of the Father, that He would give, even in His disciples, to His Son the victory over the world. And this is the ground-thought in this conclusion of His prayer.[1] The world, as world, as knowing not God, according to everlasting justice, must succumb and melt away in the strife with Him in whom is the knowledge of God. For His knowledge of God is founded in His divinity, in His inner, living fellowship with God—is thus itself manifestly divine power and righteousness. In proportion, on the other hand, as the world has not known God, it is estranged from God; the degree of its ignorance is the degree of its self-frustration, its powerlessness, its unrighteousness. Therefore Christ's knowledge of God must maintain the victory over the world's forgetfulness and ignorance of God. But as it must maintain the victory in His case, so also in that of the disciples to whom He has communicated it. They have already attained the knowledge that Christ is sent into the world from the Father, and so far they have also attained the knowledge of God. But if they have already known the Son as the Messiah of the Father, they have not yet known Him as the

[1] Tholuck, p. 375.

everlasting image of the Father in His glory before the world. And as much as is still wanting to them of the knowledge of Christ, so much is still wanting to them likewise of the knowledge of the Father. But now Christ prayed for them, that their knowledge might be perfect. He addresses Himself finally for them to the righteousness of God itself. Even in the meaning and according to the equity of righteousness, He is certain of the hearing of His intercession. He declares this in the words, 'I have declared unto them Thy name, and will declare it.'

This, moreover, is the purpose and the result,—that that love wherewith the Father hath loved the Son will also be in them; as love to the Son and as love to them, His members, in one love. Thus shall believers find themselves again in God through Christ. Thus also will Christ be in them, dwell in them, on the earth. It is the Amen of this great prayer, the certainty that Christ abides in His people upon earth till His work is completed.

After the Lord, in this intuitive assurance of dependence, had committed Himself, His disciples, and His work to the Father, He took the final decisive step by crossing over the brook Kidron.

NOTES.

1. There has seldom been a more unblushing proof that antagonistic criticism is at variance, not singly with the theologic world-view of the New Testament, but just as much also with its moral spirit, than in the terrible indignation with which Bruno Bauer (*Kritik der Evang. Geschichte* iii. 229–232) treats the gradual unmasking of the traitor in the company of the disciples, according to the representation of John.

2. The words καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, would perhaps be more fittingly rendered, It were better for him that he had never been born as that man! instead of, as usually, It would be better for that man that he had never been born. Comp. John ix. 2. In the first case, Jesus indeed beholds in the earthly birth of Judas already the one evil he has brought with him into the world—a fatal disposition in his special origin. This thought is perfectly consistent with the Christian view of life. On the other hand, it is more difficult, if, according to the ordinary interpretation, the curse on the general growth of Judas is attributed to human existence. For the

reality of his existence must be maintained, as of a human existence, and of an existence humanly appointed by God.

3. Neander finds in John xiii., between vers. 32 and 33, 'the most suitable place for the institution of the Lord's Supper.' But, in fact, a consistent and harmonious discourse would thereby be broken through just at the beginning. Against the view that the institution of the Lord's Supper followed between what Christ says in ver. 33, and what Peter says, ver. 36, Neander observes, that in this case 'the attention of the disciples must needs have been especially directed to this last significant discourse of Christ;' and that it cannot be supposed 'that Peter would have still been specially thinking on what Christ had previously spoken, ver. 33, when these words must have been rather detached from their meaning to him, by the interpolated discourse of the institution of the Lord's Supper.' But there would have been no danger of this, since even the Lord's Supper referred to the departure of Christ, and actually had the design to compensate to the disciples for the absence of Jesus till His return to them. We place the appointment of the Lord's Supper, notwithstanding, substantially, not between various verses in John, but in, or even after, the verses 34 and 35.

4. Even Sepp has declared himself (iii. 376), with many arguments, against the supposition that Christ partook of the paschal feast at the legally appointed time, and was crucified on the first festival day of the Passover. He brings forward, among other things, that on great feast-days no judgments were given among the Jews, least of all in the night of the Passover. But compare what Tholuck has produced against this argument in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (316). We must take into consideration the quotation from the Gemara tr. Sanhedrim: 'The Sanhedrim assembles in the session-room of the stone-chamber from morning to evening sacrifice; but on Sabbaths and feast-days they assemble בחיל, *i.e.*, in the lower enclosure, which surrounded the greater, in the neighbourhood of the fore-court of the women.' But especially the citation from the Mischna: 'An elder who does not submit himself to the judgment of the Sanhedrim, shall be taken from his dwelling to Jerusalem, there kept until one of these festivals, and on the festival put to death for the purpose alleged, Deut. xvii. 13.' The circumstance, that in the night of the betrayal Peter pro-

duced two swords, probably proves nothing, although, according to the Mischna, it was forbidden to go out on the festival Sabbath with arms. It may be asked how far such ordinances as these were actually binding at that time, and how far they were conditional; in any case, they might be to the Lord and His disciples probably just as little synonymous with the Mosaic law as other institutions of a like kind. At least in so extraordinary a night! That the water-carrier whom the disciples meet at the entrance to the city when they are going to prepare the Passover, meets them *just before sunset*, is a supposition which Sepp indulges, as groundlessly as the one that he had been fetching water for preparing the unleavened bread. Just as arbitrarily, he assumes that when Simon of Cyrene was laid hold of and laden with the cross of Jesus, *he had been publicly carrying wood on the Sabbath-day, home from the field.* As little is the opinion established, that the women after the crucifixion had made haste to buy the ointment (before the beginning of the Sabbath). Moreover, that during the feast, they, just as Nicodemus also, might care for the preparing of the ointment, does not suggest any difficulty. Besides, the expression of John xix. 31, that that approaching day after the crucifixion was a great feast-day, is only referrible to the first feast-day, since the Jews only considered the first and the last feast-days as great feast-days, but not the intervening ones, which only formed half holidays. But is the latter true of a special Sabbath-day which fell in the festival time?

Finally, the expression of the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. v. 7, that Christ was slain for us as the true Passover lamb, cannot with any probability prove anything about the time.

5. That the Passover was a sacrifice, is distinctly asserted in Scripture (Exod. xxxiv. 25). This appears also from the precept, that the paschal lamb (sheep or goat) must be male, of one year old, and without blemish; that it must be put to death in the fore-court of the temple; that its blood (which, in the first celebration, was stricken on the door-posts) must be caught by a priest, and poured out on the altar; that, finally, the portions of fat of the animal were placed upon the altar and burnt. But, as a sacrifice, the Passover could only fall under the category of thank- or peace-offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים), especially of offering of praise (comp. Lev. vii.). Hence the freer treatment of the pre-

paration of this sacrifice. Especially is it worthy of note, that every Israelite might kill this sacrifice. Therein was the foundation of the special priesthood in Israel expressed, or the general priesthood of the Israelitish fathers of families. After the taking away of the most special parts of the sacrifice (fat and blood), the offering was entirely eaten. There could be nothing of the flesh reserved for a special meal; all that remained must be burnt. The meal must be partaken of in the place of the sanctuary,—the booths of the pilgrims, even in the neighbourhood of the city, being doubtless reckoned as such. But as a kind of praise-offering, which is related to the atonement, it presupposes the sin-offering (Lev. xvi. and xvii.); and it is a complete mistake of the character of this sacrifice, to seek to bring it into the category of sin-offerings.[1] Hence also it may be explained, that the Jews liked to put to death on the feast-days (thus also probably on the Passover feast) such as appeared to be punishable as false prophets; and besides, seditious persons (comp. Tholuck, *John*, 317). We must, in this place, also have in mind the robbers. As far as concerns the celebration of the sacrifice, it is plain that the later ritual differs in some points from that of the first Passovers. Then, the blood of the Passover lamb was stricken on the door-posts; later, it was poured out on the altar in the temple. The guests in the former case partook

[1] [Kurtz (*History of the O. Covenant* ii. 297) shows the bearing of this question on the Romish view of the Eucharist as a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ; and that the proper defence of the Protestant theory is not the denial of the sacrificial nature of the paschal lamb, but the maintenance of its typical character. The true nature of the paschal feast he declares in the following words: 'If the door-posts of the Israelites had to be sprinkled with the blood of the slain lamb, in order that the judicial wrath of God might not smite them with the Egyptians; and if Jehovah spared their houses solely because they were marked with this blood, the only inference that can be drawn is, that the blood was regarded as possessing an expiatory virtue, by which their sins were covered and atoned for, though otherwise they would have exposed them to the wrath of God.' And if so, then whether it had all the ritual characteristics of a sin-offering or not (and we are to bear in mind that the ritual of Moses was not yet appointed), it certainly possessed the essential nature and the full efficacy of such sacrifices, and pointed distinctly to the one sacrifice for sin. And thus the Lord's Supper is its exact counterpart, it also being a *Eucharist*, only because it is a symbolic commemoration of the same one sin-offering.—ED.]

of the meat standing, in travelling dress; in the latter they partook reclining round the table. There, in that night of terror, they dared not go before the door; here they partake of the meal in many other houses than those in which they dwell (in this case the master of the house received the skin of the roasted Passover lamb, and the earthen vessel that was used); only it is prescribed that they are not to leave the holy city (*i.e.*, its precincts possibly). Originally the festival was celebrated according to the appointment, that one family alone consumed the lamb; or if it were not sufficiently numerous, it included some persons more. Later, it was established that the number of guests was not to be under ten, and not over twenty. Originally all the members of the family, without exception, were guests; subsequently, those of the female sex were not bound to participate, although they were not positively excluded. It is, moreover, to be noticed, that, according to the perfection of the Levitical ordinance, the levitically impure were not to partake of the Passover lamb. They must hold their Passover on the fourteenth day of the following month (Zif); those likewise who had been prevented from taking part in the great Passover. This celebration was called the latter Passover. Besides, it is perhaps possible that in later times the Rabbis totally obscured and altered many characteristics of original significance: as, for example, this kind of thing has occurred to the Roman Catholic theologians with the holy communion, in that they have changed this real thank- and peace-offering into a continuous sin-offering.

The feast began with washing of hands and prayer. Thanksgiving for the feast-day followed, by the declaration that the feast is for a remembrance of the exodus from Egypt. Thereupon followed the benediction of the first cup, with the thanksgiving, 'Praised be Thou, Lord our God, the King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine.' To this point Christ first of all gave a new meaning, in indicating (Luke) the festival as a pre-celebration of His death, and as a type of a new celebration which He should hold with His disciples in His kingdom. [[1](1.) The paschal supper began with a cup of wine; for the enjoyment of which, and for the day, the father of the family

[1] [The interpolations in this note are from Lightfoot's *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi. 26, whose account of the Passover is derived from Maimonides and the Talmudic tract Pesachin. A very interesting chapter on the Pass-

gives thanks, saying, 'Blessed be He that created the fruit of the vine;' and then he repeats the consecration of the day, and drinks up the cup. And afterward he blesseth concerning the washing of hands, and washeth. (2.) Then the bitter herbs (מרורים) are set on, brought in on a table ready covered. Of these the father partakes, and gives thanks for the eating of the herbs, dipped in sour sauce. And this first dipping is used only for that reason, that children may observe and inquire; for it is unusual for men to eat herbs before meat.' (3.) Afterward there is set on unleavened bread, and the sauce called חרוסת, and the lamb.] Then began the meal, probably thus kept with a view to make it appear at first as a dim enigma. The table with the food was placed in the midst. 'The father of the household praised God for the fruits of the earth. He then dipped for every guest a portion of bitter herbs as large as an olive [less than the quantity of an olive he must not eat] into a jelly of apples and almonds (called *charoseth*), and handed it to them. The table was again put on one side, possibly to increase[1] the expressiveness of the riddle. [Now they mingle the second cup for the father.] Here came the question of the son to the father of the family, and then followed the announcement, as first generally with the performance of the biblical hymn, Deut. xxvi. 5. To this moment of the feast, the so-called Hagada —the announcement—probably the word of the Apostle Paul refers: As often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall *show forth* the Lord's death till He come.

Then began the more definite explanation of the feast. The table was again drawn back. First of all the Passover in general was interpreted: 'Because in Egypt God passed over the dwellings of the forefathers.' Then the householder lifted on high bitter herbs, and declared their meaning: 'Because the Egyptians visited the life of our fathers with bitterness, as is written of them (Exod. i. 14), they made their lives bitter.' In the same manner he raised on high an unleavened loaf, and gave an answer to the question, Wherefore do we eat this unleavened

over will be found in Witsius, *De Œcon. Fed.* iv. 9, founded upon the elaborate treatment of the subject by Bochart in his *Hierozoic.* ii. 50. See also Kurtz, as above.—ED.]

[1] This ceremony was probably less essential, just as the frequent handwashings of the father of the family at various parts of the meal.

bread? with the word, 'The dough of our fathers was not yet leavened when the Almighty God led them suddenly forth from Egypt, as appears in the law' (Exod. xii. 39). Hereupon follows the thanksgiving for the miracle of redemption [viz., 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord God, our King eternal, redeeming us, and redeeming our fathers out of Egypt, and bringing us to this night; that we may eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs']. The song of praise [Ps. cxiii. and cxiv., the first part of the Hallel] was sung, and the second cup, filled with red wine [mixed previously, as mentioned above], was consecrated with thanksgiving, and went the round. These portions of the festival probably belong to the announcement, as the more distinct explanations thereof.

Then, however, began the peculiar feast, to which the guests lay down, whereas hitherto they had been standing—the partaking of the paschal lamb. They eat to it single pieces of bread, which they dipped into the jelly, or into the sauce which stood on the table, and into which also the bitter herbs were dipped. Hereupon followed the solemn breaking of bread with which the second half of the celebration, the feast of unleavened bread, took its beginning. 'As the Oriental expresses his joy by a superfluity of meats, so his grief is expressed by a more limited meal; therefore in this night bread could only be furnished in pieces, and was also blessed in this manner.'[1] This is the distribution of bread which Jesus consecrated for a remembrance of His broken body.[2] As soon as the meal was ended, the third cup was distributed. Thus, as the first cup intimated the beginning of the solemnity, and thus was devoted to the feast-day, and as the second celebrated *the announcement*, thus in like manner the third pointed to the thanksgiving for the meal partaken of.

[1] Friedlieb, 56.

[2] [Washing his hands, and taking two loaves, he breaks one, and lays the broken upon the whole one, and blesseth it, 'Blessed be He who causeth bread to grow out of the earth;' and putting some bread and bitter herbs together (Meyer says, 'wrapping a piece of bread round with bitter herbs'), he dips them in the sauce charoseth, and blessing, 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord God, our eternal King, He who hath sanctified us by His precepts, and hath commanded us to eat;' he eats the unleavened bread and bitter herbs together. From thenceforward he lengthens out the supper, eating this or that as he hath a mind; and last of all he eats of the flesh of the Passover, at least as much as an olive; but after this he tastes not at all of any food.]

Thus it was the cup of thanksgiving, the Eucharist in a narrow sense [כסא הברכה]. This cup Christ consecrated into the cup of the new covenant in His blood. Thence it follows probably that with the third cup was always closed the solemnity of the old covenant.

Finally were then sung once more some psalms [cxv.–cxviii., the second part of the Hallel], and with the partaking of the fourth cup the assembly was broken up.[1] The festival must be brought to an end before midnight.

But now the solemnity of the new era of liberation went on through the circle of the feast-days: the partaking of unleavened bread in these days, indicated the poor but consecrated and joyous wandering life of the people of God. The consecration of the beginning harvest, which took place on the second feast-day, when the sheaf of first-fruits was brought into the fore-court of the temple, and the grain was there extracted and ground, and out of the meal a meat-offering was prepared (Lev. ii. 14), expressed the blending of the theocratic institution with the blessing of civilisation. Also the partaking of wine referred, probably, not only to the blood of the thank-offering, but also to the festal joy which wine, as the blood of the grape vine, the noblest tree of nature, diffuses, and by which it is appropriated to the representation in speaking symbol and seal of the highest festal disposition of men, who attain it by the partaking of the blood of Christ, of the innermost expression of His heartfelt surrender and offering up to God for them. The noblest means of nourishment, and the noblest means of enlivening on the earth, were consecrated as symbols of the noblest means of nourishment and of making alive from heaven. The Passover brought to light the character of the great feast of thank-offering, in which it formed the contrast to the great feast of sin-offering, by the fact, that besides the special burnt-offerings which were daily offered in behalf of the nation, thank-offerings were again offered for individuals, which then served for special times of sacrificial feasts.

[1] [Lightfoot does not mention a fifth cup, but Meyer cites an authority to show that a fifth cup, with the singing of Psalms cxx.–cxxxvii., might still follow. So also Bynæus (*De Morte Christi* i. 618) quotes Maimonides to the following effect: 'Potest tamen infundi calix quintus, et dici super eo hymnus magnus (the Great Hallel) a: *Celebrate Jehovam, quia bonus*, usque: *Ad flumina Babelis.* Sed calix hic non est ex debito, sicut alii quatuor calices.'—ED.]

The people celebrated a common and happy feast of thank-offering of this kind generally just before the expiration of the 15th Nisan, the so-called Chagiga, in which small or great cattle, male or female, were used. This sacrificial meal was probably the strongest expression of the feast of thank-offering that was celebrated through the entire Passover feast.

6. In reference to the rearing of the vine in the East, Jahn observes (*Bibl. Antiq.*, sec. 68), according to Bochart, 'that the inhabitants in Antaradus (in Phœnicia) pruned the vine three times a year—the first time in March; and after the stem had hereupon borne grapes, they again cut off the twigs which had no fruit. The stem then in April bore new twigs, on some of which again appeared clusters of grapes; but those which were without fruit were again cut off in May: the stem then shot forth for the third time, and the new shoot bore new grapes.' Hence it is not difficult to suppose that there were laid heaps of cut-off and withered branches in the gardens of the valleys near Jerusalem, at the time that Jesus went forth from Jerusalem over the Kidron (in the night of the 14th Nisan, 6th April). There might be a reason for piling up brushwood of this kind, if by help of the same the remains of the paschal lamb were burnt up on the paschal night (Ex. xii. 10; Num. ix. 12; Friedlieb, *Archäol.* 59). Here it is to be considered, that formerly the city of Jerusalem extended more deeply downwards below Gethsemane, as far as the valley. If we conceive ourselves outside the valley on the banks of the Kidron, surrounded with pilgrims' booths, and with Passover seasons in all their dwellings, which had been just a little before concluded, it is obvious to suppose that in many cases, in the gardens around, the remains of the feast (even although it were only the bones) were burnt by the help of the garden brushwood that lay there, especially as in this case the Sabbath was so close at hand.

That this burning must have happened in part outside the booths or tents, is suggested by the probable danger of fire. It is very remarkable that the lighting up of the Easter light in the Romish Church is referred to the night of the paschal solemnity, and at the same time to the pillar of fire which formerly preceded the children of Israel. (The connection between the paschal feast and the pillar of fire appears to be suggested in Num. ix. 16. See Staudenmeier, '*der Geist des Christen-*

thums,' 503.) If now even in the Gallic Church and in the British Church the new fire was lighted on the night of Thursday in Passion-week (Binterim's *Archäologie*), this points back probably from the varying use of the West to the original custom of the Lord's Supper of Asia Minor, on the evening after the 14th Nisan, as a characteristic which must have originally harmonized with this. The whole symbolic nature of lights, however, will, as well as the Easter fire, become more intelligible if we return to the supposition that the Jews, on the paschal night, must have already lighted numerous fires, and that these must probably have been publicly lighted in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, probably abundantly, according to the situations of the dwellings in the gardens. From this reference is explained the fact, that the Passover fire, even in Jerusalem, still plays so considerable a part.

SECTION III.

JESUS IN GETHSEMANE. THE STRUGGLE AND VICTORY OF HIS PASSION OF SOUL.

(Matt. xxvi. 36–46; Mark xiv. 32–42; Luke xxii. 39–46; John xviii. 1–12, 13.)

The garden (κῆπος) of Gethsemane[1] was situated on the farther side of the brook Kidron, at the foot of the Mount of Olives. It was an estate (χωρίον), in all probability, with a dwelling-house upon it, but certainly provided as an olive garden with a wine-press and a tower. Tradition still points out this garden to the traveller in Jerusalem, and we have no ground to dispute the accuracy of this recollection.[2]

[1] גַּת שְׁמָנֵא, oil-press. [The various derivations assigned to this word are given by Bynæus (ii. 73–7). Lightfoot renders it 'the place of the olive-presses.' This meaning seems now to be universally adopted, instead of that proposed by the older scholars (Erasmus, Beza, Vossius, and Grotius), who supposed it to be the same name, though of a different place, which is found in Isa. xxviii. 1, גֵּיא־שְׁמָנִים.—Ed.]

[2] Compare Tischendorf, *Reise in den Orient*, i. 311, 312. Less decidedly, Robinson, i. 235, although he alleges no reasons against the identity of the

Hence it was probably through what is now known as Stephen's Gate, or Mary's Gate,[1] that Jesus went forth from the city with the disciples. Down the steep declivity of the temple mountain they descended into the valley, through which ran the torrent Kidron, the black brook,[2] on its way to the Dead Sea. The road over the brook leads to Bethany.

But at this time the Lord was not going to Bethany. It was too late for that; and besides, it was contrary to the ordinance of the Passover to go at all out of the range of the city. Thus, what the circumstances in this case rendered necessary, harmonized entirely with what God designed. He turned away from the familiar road to Bethany into the fatal garden, although He well knew what would be the result of His entrance there. It was not for the first time indeed that He turned in thither. He had often accompanied His disciples thither (*συνήχθη*). Probably they might often meet there after leaving Jerusalem, one by one, to go to Bethany. This rendezvous might also have served for larger meetings with the company of His hidden disciples in Jerusalem. In any case, we cannot but suppose that Jesus was friendly with the proprietor of that estate; for he had freely allowed Him to make use of his property by day and night.[3]

place. [Thomson (*Land and Book*, 634) expresses himself strongly against the claims of the spot now shown. He says, 'The authenticity of this sacred garden Mr Williams says he chooses rather to believe than to defend. I do not choose even to believe.' After mentioning that the Latins have chosen one site, the Greeks another, he goes on: 'My own impression is, that both are wrong. . . . I am inclined therefore to place the garden in the secluded vale several hundred yards to the north-east of the present Gethsemane, and hidden, as I hope for ever, from the idolatrous intrusion of all sects and denominations.'—Ed.]

[1] According to Schulz, *Jerusalem* (Berlin, 1845), p. 90, identical with the ancient Fish-gate.

[2] Κεδρών; קִדְרוֹן, the black, dark-coloured, or muddy brook. Probably its name arose from the circumstance that it rushed torrent-wise with muddy waves through the dark rocky valley. During the period of the flourishing temple-worship, its water was likewise darkened by the influx of the blood of the sacrifices from the temple mountain.—Sepp, iii. 453. [Lightfoot, on John xviii. 1, states that the blood ran down through a conduit under ground into the brook Kidron, and was sold to the gardeners to dung their gardens with; so that the Kidron was 'rather the sink or common sewer of the city than a brook.'—Ed.]

[3] [There is no doubt that *χωρίον* frequently means a small estate or pro-

But as soon as they had entered upon the enclosure of the estate, Jesus was seized and shaken by a marvellous feeling. He neither would nor could endure this experience in their presence! First of all, He hastened on from the sight of the eleven, saying to them, 'Sit ye *here*, while I go *yonder* and pray.' Then He took farther on with Him the three most confidential disciples, Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, James and John. But they had not advanced far together, when His sensations became more and more evident (ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν). He began to be *sorrowful* and *disquieted*, and to feel Himself so terribly *abandoned*, that the disciples observed it. He felt Himself oppressed even to astonishment or terror. This was one aspect of His experience—nameless contrarieties of sensation overwhelmed Him, and choked and straitened His heart as if they would have stifled and killed Him.[1] The infinite living movements of His soul in the Holy Spirit, in the joy of His God,[2] were restrained by an inconceivable reaction. Moreover, closely connected therewith, He felt Himself namelessly *forsaken*, as if every heart and life in the world had refused to Him the strength and encouragement of its sympathy[3]—as if in the whole wide world no echo would any more respond to the beating of His heart. These two sensations afflicted Him in so

perty; but it seems doubtful whether it is so used here, or whether it belonged to a friend of our Lord. It may be noticed, in passing, that there were no gardens allowed within the city (except a few of roses), on account of the smell arising from the rotting weeds and manure.—ED.]

[1] This is the meaning of λυπεῖσθαι, which Mark at once, in its strongest form, indicates as ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι. They are the sensations of a positive adverse influence, which checks and oppresses the soul in its life movements, as if it would rob it of spiritual breath. The first effect of it is pain. The last, anguish, intensely aroused opposition of soul.

[2] John xvii. 13.

[3] This is expressed by ἀδημονεῖν, whereby is intimated the experience of a negative resistance; first of all, the feeling of remoteness from His people and His father-land, but generally the feeling of abandonment—of discouragement. [The three words expressive of our Lord's agitation and agony of soul are most fully explained by Pearson (*Creed*, p. 281, note, ed. 1835), and shown to represent Him 'suddenly, upon a present and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement, encompassed with grief, and overwhelmed with sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.' Perhaps the author presses too strongly the *etymological* signification of ἀδημονεῖν.—ED.]

lively a manner, that He came with His companions to a stand-still, acknowledged to them His nameless distress—'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;' and after still further appealing to them, 'Stay here and watch!'—which, in its significance, includes in it the words which Luke records, Pray that ye fall not into temptation—He disengaged Himself from them (*ἀπεσπάσθη*), and hastened forward. But He went only a stone's-throw farther,[1] and cast Himself down upon the earth, kneeling; and with His countenance bent to the earth, He prayed that, if *it were possible, the hour might pass away from Him.* In these words, often too little considered, Mark has told us the ground-thought of Christ's supplication. His first petition cried, Father, *My Father*,[2] all things are possible with Thee. If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me. But not as I will, but as Thou wilt.

Upon this prayer He experienced the first strengthening. Luke indicates it, when he says: And there appeared unto Him an angel from heaven, strengthening Him. That an angel appeared to Him was chiefly certain to the Evangelists, from the fact that He received the first strengthening upon the first prayer. And the latter may be gathered from His being able to return to the disciples after the first prayer. But how could the Evangelists infer the angel from the strengthening? Was, perhaps, the angel to be taken here in an allegorical sense, as the angel of the hearing of prayer?[3] Upon this allegorical view, the Evangelists were perhaps led away, by placing themselves by the Spirit of Christ into the situation. What the Lord suffered was, in any case, a consequence of the entire antipathy of the

[1] *Προσελθὼν μικρὸν*, say the two first Evangelists.

[2] Mark, *Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ.* [This is beautifully paraphrased by Sir Matthew Hale, in his edifying treatise, *Of the Knowledge of Christ Crucified:* 'It is not a stranger that importunes Thee, it is Thy Son; that Son in whom Thou didst proclaim Thyself well pleased; that Son whom Thou hearest always; it is He that begs of Thee, and begs of Thee a dispensation from that which He most declines, because He most loves Thee, the terrible, insupportable hiding Thy face from Me.' An elaborate discussion of these words, as, indeed, of every point connected with the concluding scenes of our Lord's life, will be found in Bynæus. He has very properly named his work 'Commentarius Amplissimus.'—Ed.]

[3] 'The strengthening by the angel is to be understood of the accession of spiritual power which came to the struggling Redeemer in His deepest destitution.'—Olshausen, *in loc.*

world being now opposed to His soul like a wall (just as formerly, in the wilderness, the entire sympathy of the world had hindered Him like a wall, and driven Him back into the wilderness), whilst the sympathy of His friends was so weak that it could no longer afford Him encouragement. But both the one and the other were God's ordering, which confounded Him. But when He now rose up again strengthened, what could it have been whereby the Father comforted Him? In the world nothing was yet altered. His prayer had not yet shaken the earth. Perhaps, however, it had shaken heaven! The world of blessed spirits drew nearer to Him, their sympathy revealed itself to Him in a refreshing feeling, which became His by a glimpse into it, in an appearance of angels which strengthened Him. The older scholastic theology has resisted the thought that Christ was strengthened by an angel, because it chose to consider Him most in His Godhead. But Christ, the God-man, might possibly be strengthened by an angel in His human feeling of life. How often the faith even of the little and of the young cheered Him on the way of His pilgrimage! In any case, the Evangelist Luke might possibly know historically of such an angelic appearance; and, moreover, he might have the certainty, through the spirit of revelation, that Christ had been strengthened by a communication from the angel-world (more definitely represented by the appearance of an angel).

Thus Christ returned, strengthened by prayer to the Father, to the disciples. But when He returned to them, He found them sleeping. We might certainly conclude, on the one hand, from this, that the first interval of prayer did not last merely a couple of moments;[1] but on the other hand, also, we might suppose that the three disciples found themselves in an exceedingly peculiar uneasiness and depression. In any case, they certainly had no clear consciousness of the significance of this moment; while a gloomy feeling of the misfortune in which they were, and of the danger which threatened them, a terrible sense of despondency, rather served to overwhelm them with drowsiness than to arouse them (Luke xxii. 45). Like a giant's might, the sleep of bodily exhaustion, of spiritual depression and dis-

[1] Sepp supposes, iii. 457, that the first interval of prayer lasted one hour, as Jesus, returning, said to the disciples, Could ye not watch with Me *one hour*?

couragement, fell upon them; and they did not feel how perilous this spirit of slumber was in this condition,—that it was comparable to that craving for sleep which invades the exhausted wanderers in the wintry desert, which induces the inexperienced to surrender themselves to death, while he who knows it gathers himself together with anxiety and agitation to resist the hostile power—labours even to perspiration, and so avoids the danger. Thus the Lord found them sleeping then, although they had just seen Him go away in the deepest suffering. Thus He found them all alike, the spiritual John, the quietly firm James, the fiery Peter. But to the *last* He addressed with reason the word of reproach, since he had most highly presumed (and perhaps also slept the soundest), 'Simon, sleepest thou! Could ye not watch with Me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation (enhancing the temptation by your own fault, changing the external into an inward temptation): the spirit truly is willing (with him, Peter, it is still eagerly willing, *πρόθυμον*), but the flesh is weak' (powerless, *ἀσθενής*). Only the strictest watchfulness can abolish the risk which arises from this absolute contrast between the innermost spiritual impulse and the powerless sensual nature.

With this word, whose whole importance in this moment only Jesus Himself knew, the sense of anguish and desertion, according to Luke, came over Him again even more powerfully, and He hastened away from the disciples a second time. Mark says that it was the same word again which He uttered to the Father. This is perhaps true *of the word* generally, but in Matthew there appears a somewhat modified conception: 'My Father, if this cup may not pass from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done.' The first time He supposed the possibility that the cup of sorrows which was presented to Him might pass away from Him, He asked that it might be averted, with the expression, if it be possible. But, at the same time, He declared the submission of His heart to the will of God. But the second time He expressed His wish that the cup might pass away in a much more subdued manner, and allowed distinctly to appear the feeling that He *must* drink it, by the words, if it be not possible that the cup should pass from Me. And just as decidedly He declared His readiness to drink it, according to the will of the Father. Thus once again He found consolation, and returned

to the three. But again He found them sleeping. Two of the Evangelists add, by way of explanation, that their eyes were heavy with sleep. An inexplicable intoxication of sleep weighed them terribly down; and when He awakened them, they were so confused, that they knew not what they should answer Him.

He needed only for one moment thus to see them, when once more the unspeakable anguish came over Him. Before they had collected themselves for a reply, He was quickly gone once more from their eyes. He remained away long, at least so long that the disciples, who had been twice warned and awakened, sank back again into their lassitude and helplessness, and for the third time could go to sleep. According to Matthew, He prayed again as on the former time. He surrendered His will, He gave Himself to the Father, yea, He drank the cup. For now, perhaps, arrived the last and greatest crisis of His contest, which Luke depicts to us. His feeling became the most terrible jarring of life, like to a death-struggle (agony). His resistance to the mighty influence which He experienced consisted in the fact that He prayed with the utmost earnestness. The effect of this struggle, moreover, broke forth in His sweat, becoming like drops of blood, which fell down upon the earth.[1] But under this most vehement prayer of surrender, His

[1] The possibility that, in the case of a man in special circumstances, a bloody sweat might appear, is perhaps sufficiently authenticated. Compare Ebrard, 418. But Olshausen reasonably observes that the ὡσεί would be altogether out of place if special drops of blood were spoken of herewith; we must refer to the well-known similar but manifestly false view of the ὡσεί (ὡσεί περιστεράς), Luke iii. 22. Thus the addition, καταβαίνοντες, etc., does not attain its full significance except by the conviction that here is a comparison. The sweat of Jesus is compared to drops of blood; and, indeed, with such as they appear in their great heavy dropping down to the earth. Thus much is now certain. The sweat of Jesus' struggle had in it something altogether peculiar, which made it similar to drops of blood—first of all surely the large form of the drops, then the one by one heavy falling down or trickling upon the ground; whether also the bloody hue, does not at least appear from the text. Catholic theologians (Sepp, iii. 458) refer here to the 'blood of sorrows, which so copiously appears in mystically ecstatic persons in the Catholic Church, by way of imitation,' etc. For the explanation of the special nature of these blood-like drops, probably the history of the 'Stigmata' in the Catholic Church might not be altogether without significance. In any case, it stands in close relation to the remaining interpretation of this place. [So far as we know, nothing at all has been advanced which gives ground for departing from the *more usual* mean-

soul finally attained, for the third time, once more its serenity and rest; and *now* for ever His victory was decided.

This was manifest in the changed and decisive manner in which He again returned to His disciples. He did not wake them up with the request that they would watch with Him, as the first, and probably also the second time, but with a rebuking word, which expressed the celebration of His returning peace: 'Do ye sleep on now, and take your rest?' (the last third pause before the preparation for the crisis). Therewith it is ended. 'Behold, the hour is come that the Son of man is delivered into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us depart: behold, he who betrayeth Me is at hand.' And now, when finally the disciples entirely recovered themselves, they beheld perhaps the traces of His last struggle still upon His brow, as drops of sweat like to blood trickled down from it. To them it was as if they beheld Him already surrounded with blood, while His soul displayed the noblest majesty of peace.

The narrative of the passion of soul of Jesus in Gethsemane guarantees its authenticity by its enigmatically mysterious nature. It is a representation which lies beyond the mental capacity of ordinary human or Christian invention. It belongs to those portions which the Church, in all its weak moods, members, and theologians, most of all in its weak critics, would have in many ways surrendered, because of presumed offences, and which it has only preserved in consequence of its most substantial motives, namely, in its historical faithfulness in the transmission of this history—in the earnest conviction that there were heavenly depths in it, and in the momentary gleams of knowledge in which they recognised its profound significance.[1]

The manner in which many exegetes have made attempts on this section, reminds us of the slumbrous intoxication of the dis-

ing of ὡσεί, as denoting likeness, and here meaning that the sweat merely resembled blood as it falls in thick, heavy drops. Alford says that if mere resemblance to blood were meant, the insertion of αἵματος would be absurd; 'why not drops of anything else?' Because nothing else oozes out from the human body and falls from it, as the sweat was in this case rolling down and falling. 'And drops of blood *from what* and *where*?' Why, of course, from a human body, which was here the object in view. Nothing can be more natural and vivid than such a comparison, and no more natural expression could be given to it than is given by the words of the text.—ED.]

[1] Strauss, ii. 428.

ciples. The conduct of later criticism, however, in respect of this important moment in the life of the Lord, as it has been manifested in many critics, deserves to be characterized in an entirely different manner.[1]

The fact that the Evangelist John does not relate the passion of Jesus in Gethsemane, is explained by the strict exclusiveness of his plan, but not perhaps by the supposition that he followed the rest of the Evangelists, as a gleaner on the field of evangelical history—as completer.[2] Moreover, although this Evangelist has previously described a similar soul-struggle of Jesus, it does not perhaps follow thence that that must be confounded with this passion of Jesus in Gethsemane. On the contrary, even the representation of the passion of Jesus in Gethsemane testifies in itself of a rhythmic return of the fearful presentiment of suffering in His life. Thus it was, moreover, in entire accordance with that wonderful feeling which finally overflowed the soul of Jesus in three great wave-beats, and with its highest point reached its end, that the billows of the same feeling had affected Him long before. The first beginnings of this presentiment occur early in the evangelic history. Thus Jesus heaved a deep sigh in Galilee, when He saw Himself constrained to allow His contest with the Pharisees to appear publicly, and to encourage His little flock to constancy He foretold to them His victory over the hatred of the world; but even with this anticipation of His victory came also the presentiment of His last struggle, and He declared that He was greatly straitened till it was accomplished (Luke xii. 50).[3] A similar feeling was manifested when the Pharisees stopped His passage for ever in that region (Mark viii. 12). Thus He wept over Jerusalem, when in His festal entry He looked upon the city from the top of the Mount of Olives. Thus His soul was

[1] Materialistic modes of viewing,—explanations of the passion of Jesus by a bodily indisposition or cold; sensualistic, sentimental explanations of it, by the fear of death or the pain of separation, etc. The most prevailing views are recorded by Strauss, ii. 431.

[2] The argumentation against the accuracy of this narrative in Strauss (ii. 438), which proceeds on the failure of the history in John, depends here, as in other cases, on the untenable supposition, that every Evangelist purposed to communicate every possible thing in the life of Jesus, without any plan at all.

[3] See above, vol. iii. p. 194. Comp. Hug (as above), ii. 144.

shaken when, in the enclosure of the temple,[1] those Greeks caused themselves to be announced to Him, whom He regarded as the first-fruits of the believing Gentiles. No wonder if this same feeling appeared again subsequently in its highest power, at a moment which was entirely calculated to arouse it.

And thus, as that first stronger manifestation of His anxious presentiment was a consequence of the vivid foresight of His victory; as on the height of the Mount of Olives His great suffering was a consequence of the great exaltation which His people prepared for Him in His elect; and as in the temple enclosure it was the first demonstrations of homage of the Gentile world which filled Him with a stronger presentiment of His approaching end,—thus now also His strongest depression in Gethsemane follows upon the great elevation which His soul had just undergone, in the removal of the power of darkness from the company of disciples, in the institution of the holy communion, and in the great surrender of His life, of His disciples and His work, into the hands of His Father.

And we must lay an altogether special stress upon this connection of the soul-passion of Jesus in Gethsemane, with the preceding consecration of soul, as it was completed in the high-priestly prayer. Superficial and profane criticism[2] finds a contradiction in the facts, that Jesus, first of all, in the prayer above mentioned, 'had closed His account with the Father,' and that He then should once more have had to undergo a struggle in Gethsemane. But there is not needed any specially profound acquaintance with the mysteries of the higher life of the soul, especially of the Christian life of the soul, to know that frequently, upon great *spiritual victories* of self-denial, of surrender, of renunciation, which a man gains, there still follow great *spiritual tempests*, which are not to be considered as relapses, but as proofs of the greatness and purity of the sacrifice which the heart has made—in that the nature of the sacrificing heart is now claiming its right. How many a man, after that moment in which he has sacrificed to his higher calling, at any time, a happiness of his temporal life, hurries weeping to his closet! And we may gather how much the high-priestly prayer is to be

[1] Probably in the fore-court of the heathens, the symbolic destination of which changed therewith into the real one.

[2] Strauss, ii. 440.

considered chiefly under the aspect of a painful separation—of a great renunciation,—from that word of Christ, 'I am no more in the world.' That renunciation in which He had early been compelled to hold afar from Himself, and then, in its enticing deformity to refuse, the attractive picture of a noble, pure, social life with His disciples among His people for humanity, in a paradisaically bright world—that renunciation, which was now wholly completed, He had now in this manner ended. And thus we might consider the passion of Jesus, first of all, as the great sympathy of the infinitely rich, pure, human heart, in the execution of His perfect renunciation. But it was the same curse of sin which brought about this renunciation that made its pains so bitter. Jesus had now for many years sued for the faith of His people, for the love of humanity, and therein had experienced the coldness and the hatred of the world in abundant measure. He had now, *in His spirit*, resisted the contest with this enmity of the world and of hell continually tempting Him. He had finished His work, and had commended the certainty of His victory to the Father, and had solemnized it before Him. But just now, when thus in spirit He was purified for humanity, and had assured to them His institution as the means of their deliverance—now came over Him the sense of all the injustice suffered—the whole pain of rejected love. When Joseph had once entirely mastered himself in the presence of his brethren (Gen. xlv. 1), there came over his soul a tempest of emotion which broke down his self-command,—every painful feeling of wrong endured, of rejected love and faith, rising into the more terrible pain for the formerly so blinded, now so disheartened, brethren; and he caused all profane spectators to depart before he could make himself known to his brethren; and wept aloud, that the Egyptians and the house of Pharaoh heard it.[1] But how much deeper is the link between Christ and His brethren, than between Joseph and his! Thence we apprehend, that in that moment when He in heart took His leave of the whole world, which disowned Him; when He completed the institution which determines, although yet in germ, only its redemp-

[1] In Joseph also, the great feeling of agony developed itself in a rhythmical order and recurrence, till it had attained its climax (Gen. xlii. 24, xliii. 30, xlv. 1).

tion (for, with the surrender of Christ to the Father, His death also is decided), He is then overcome with a feeling of anguish which threatens to suffocate and to kill Him. It is the great sorrow of unspeakably mistaken love, as it feels it in the moment of its triumph.

But now, it may be asked, why this feeling of Christ expresses itself not in tears, as it did at the grave of Lazarus, but in a dread which is aggravated even into the sweat of terror? Here, probably, we are to consider that the emotion of Christ must immediately be changed into the deepest sympathy with humanity. Even here His care was not about His life *for its own sake*, but about His life in humanity, and this especially about the life of humanity. Thus He felt His separation as *humanity* must feel it, and actually experienced, and still experiences it, although *unconsciously*. His renunciation, as its consequence, appears in the mental life of humanity—namely, in the suffering of the world on behalf of the beautiful temporal life, which, subjected to affliction, first of all by the curse of sin, and then by the cross of Christ, is devoted to transitoriness. That suffering of the world, and of His people in the world, of which He had so lately spoken, has truly, according to its inmost nature, its foundation in this, that the kingdom of glory—the new paradise—must needs have been transferred at the ascension of Christ into the world beyond the grave. This sorrow approached nearer and nearer to Him, and now it seized His soul in all its depth. But as formerly, in the desert, the lust of the world had tempted Him, as impure desire, which was distorted into a temptation of hell; so also now He was laid hold upon, by this suffering of the world, on behalf of the theocratically beautiful present world, so it again became to Him a temptation of hell. In the wilderness, His heart had experienced and resisted the flattering crowd of all chiliastic worldly intoxications in the world. Here He resisted the storm of that chiliastic, poetically-coloured despondency of the heart, rent asunder in the wavering between the world of time and the paradise of eternity,—just as it had restlessly driven Judas about,—just as it brought the other disciples into so great danger,—as it continues to be perceived in the world still in a thousand wild tones of lamentation. But although He got better and maintained it over the Evil One, yet this attack, nevertheless, became to Him

a great temptation, through the infinite weight of human feeling which was therein, through the great heart-sorrow of the world at the remoteness of paradise, at the great gulf of death that separates earth from heaven. If thus the entire suffering of the world, all its sadness about the beauteous appearance of the happy life, fell upon His soul by means of His sympathy, and would pull Him down with it into an abyss of despondency, we may probably guess how His soul must be shaken under this influence, in order to resist the paralyzing poison of comfortlessness, especially as in this case no forty days were given Him for the struggle, but only one long hour of the night. How soon, in such a frame of mind, must the first tears which perhaps would spring forth be again dried up, and an intense sweat of anguish gradually take their place!

The retrospect of Jesus upon His life, and upon the significance of His parting, probably led to such a state of mind. But still more did His glance upon His present position. For with His renunciation, and with His separation from the world, was this infinitely terrible position of loneliness also decided, in which He was now placed. The entire world in its ungodliness is related to His godly standing as an infinitely strong antagonism, which as a spiritual opposition falls like a choking simoom upon His soul. In the same measure, moreover, as the antipathy of the world now presses upon His soul, He must be deprived of the sympathy of His disciples. He sees how His most chosen disciples go to sleep again and again before His eyes, even in the view of His anguish. And are not these, in so significant a moment, representations to Him of the intoxication of sleep with which in all times His disciples so often gazed upon the more deeply hidden sorrows of His life? He thus undergoes a twofold horror,—the horror at the antagonism of the entire world, and the horror of complete loneliness in the world. Thus must He tread the wine-press alone in the garden of Olives. This experience found its expression in the prophetic words, *Ye shall leave Me alone*, and in the appeal to the three, *Could ye not watch with Me one hour?*

Thus far His experience always appears only as the full sense of the present, as it is developed out of the retrospect upon the past. But how could He hide from Himself the future, for which the past has laid the foundation, that this present is purposing to beget? And the more plainly the image of the future appears to His

soul, the greater will be His suspense—His fearful presentiment. To this presentiment He Himself gave the most decided expression, in its entire purity and greatness, in the words, *The hour is come, when the Son of man is delivered up, is betrayed into the hands of sinners.* Well might He be terrified at the *hands of sinners, for He is the Holy One.* That which is holy in Him, trembles at this external power of the unholy over His life—the Spirit, at this subjection to the *hands*—love, at this look of hatred —the feeling of justice, at this burning experience of injustice—the nobility, at the abyss of shame—the heavenly sense of beauty, at the sink of impurity through which He would have to pass—the simple delicate Life, at this coarse and public death.[1] But to the Lord, the falling into the hands of sinners was less painful than the being betrayed into the hands of the heathen by His beloved people, the people of the promise; into the hands of dissolute Gentile soldiers, by the fathers who sate in Moses' seat; to His adversaries, finally, by a disciple from the midst of His company of disciples—by a disciple who, with the most eager wakefulness, skulked about to destroy Him, while the disciples devoted to Him—slept.

Thus the soul-passion of Christ passes over from the sorrow of sympathy at the glimpse upon the past, through the pain of abandonment in the glimpse into the present, to the anguish of fearful presentiment in the glimpse into the future. But, as we have seen, these experiences could not succeed one another in a distinct change of tones; but it was one great sorrow which expressed itself in the modulation of these experiences. The sympathy of Jesus, which at the first predominated as the effect of the high-priestly prayer, and announced itself in the sympathetic words to the disciples, In the world ye have tribulation, continued in the pain of abandonment which made itself known in the most vivid manner in the reproach to the three, Could ye not watch with Me one hour? And, in like manner, this pain continued in the fearful presentiment which finally appeared and manifested itself in the heavy sweat of His brow like unto blood.

But here we come to the most difficult question of all. Wherein consisted the sorrow, for the passing away of which Christ entreated the Father? The older Protestant theologians said rightly

[1] Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 178. Also the quotation from Luther in Olshausen upon Matt. xxvi. 38, 39.

that He experienced in Gethsemane the burden of the wrath of God in His soul,[1] and that it was this cup of anger for the averting of which He prayed. In later days, this view has been considered untenable. It has been found generally objectionable that the wrath of God should be brought into the question, the rather that this wrath should have expressed itself against Jesus, and that He should have been able to experience it as wrath.[2] It has thus in late times been supposed that Jesus is once again praying, in deep presentiment of the greatness of His suffering, for the removal of that suffering itself; in which view truly

[1] [E. G. Pearson (*Creed*, p. 283) says: 'For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law only for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners? Add unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand of God pressing upon Him all this load, laying on His shoulders at once a heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any of the saints of God.' And Sir Matthew Hale (as above) says: 'The obligation unto the punishment for our sins could not choose but work the same effects in our Saviour as it must do in the sinner (desperation and sin excepted), to wit, a sad apprehension of the wrath of God against Him. . . . As He puts on the person of the sinner, so He puts on the same sorrow, the same shame, the same fear, the same trembling under the apprehension of the wrath of His Father, that we must have done.'—ED.]

[2] Assuredly Olshausen's supposition is no *decided* improvement upon the old view—that in this situation, namely, it was only the human ψυχή of Jesus that struggled, while the fulness of the divine life withdrew itself, and that thence it may be explained how an angel could have strengthened Him. But when Strauss criticises this view with strong observations, not wholly without reason (ii. p. 441), it is overlooked that Olshausen has rightly referred to the special significance of the psychic element in this struggle, and that an infinitely great divine assistance, to which He is accustomed, truly fails to the man of the help and the sympathy of all souls—not only fails, but is directly opposed to Him. Certainly the soul of Jesus had here especially to suffer, in that it bore, in a true struggle of all souls, the temptation of all souls, in the sympathy with the suffering of all souls. But how could it be so without the Spirit, without the spirit of its life in its unity with God,—especially when the soul was hindered on all sides, afflicted through and through? One might thus almost turn the passage of Olshausen round, and say that here the Spirit of Christ has asserted itself in the withdrawal of all inspiration, of all movements of soul. But, moreover, it may not be denied that even the soul of Christ operated here, just for the reason that it must struggle with all souls, but in the power of the Spirit.

great stress is to be laid on the fact, that He does not pray for this removal unconditionally, but with a complete surrender to the will of the Father.[1] According to this apprehension, His petition has more the meaning only of a lamentable utterance of His emotion; the chief matter of the prayer is, the surrender —the sacrifice. But this view of the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane is, in fact, entangled in a real difficulty in seeking to escape from a supposed one. It calls forth a contradiction in the evangelic history itself. For it is really not to be supposed that Jesus would have now asked the Father, even if it were only conditionally, for the removal of His suffering of the cross itself, after having so distinctly predicted it, after having given Himself over, in the high-priestly prayer to the Father, so decidedly even to death. And what Strauss has said upon the supposed contradiction between the contents of His prayer and the representation of the passion of Jesus in Gethesmane, has really a meaning, so far as it may be only turned against the suggested view of the meaning of the passion of Jesus.[2]

Jesus had long before foreseen His death in the Spirit, and had offered Himself to the Father as a sacrifice, finally with the most distinct feeling of its approach, in the most solemn manner. But the flood of experiences of sorrow, of pain, and of anguish, which now burst over Him; and, moreover, as sympathy with the disposition of humanity of limitless depth, and full of the elements of temptation—this was new to Him. For this was an experience of His soul which, as such, He could not undergo in the foresight of His Spirit, but must undergo, first of all, in its own place and circumstances, in proportion to the childlikeness of His nature. And thus it came over Him now, as if it would undo and destroy Him.

[1] See De Wette on Matt. xxvi. 36–46.

[2] Neander shows very strikingly, against Strauss, that a change of moods, as occurring between the high-priestly prayer and the scene in Gethsemane, has in it nothing contradictory. He puts prominently forward, for instance, that such a change in the disposition of Jesus appears even in the single Synoptists, since everywhere in them the peaceful institution of the holy communion is placed before the painful contest in Gethsemane. But it is something altogether different to suppose not only a change of the *moods*, but also of the *purposes* of Jesus—of His *fundamental thoughts* upon the progress of His life. The former is not only possible, but necessary; the latter is opposed to the clear determination of the Lord.

We must here also remember that the heart of Jesus, even in the might of His experience, must be estimated as the heart of the Son of man, of the Prince of humanity, nay, as the heart of humanity itself, if we would guess at the greatness of these experiences from afar. He had in every situation substantially to do with humanity, with God, and with the prince of this world, the Satan; or, in other words, with sin, with righteousness, and with judgment.

We must, in the next place, especially have in mind that every experience which individual men cause to Him, is, according to His high and world-embracing position, an experience of the relation of the whole of humanity to His life. When thus Jesus was to undergo the hatred of His enemies, the treachery of one disciple, the weakness and unfaithfulness of all the other disciples, this experience became to Him a general sense of the relation of humanity towards His soul. Thence follows that in this He feels the burden of all human evil nature against Him in His soul.

Further, we must moreover vindicate the fundamental fact, that behind all human perversities, Jesus looks upon the diabolical background, always the prince of this world. Thus, in a moment in which He experiences the whole alienation of humanity in His soul, He feels its whole entanglement and bondage in the service of the evil one. Thus also He experiences (through humanity generally)[1] the mightiest influence of temptation of the powers of darkness, and indeed in this case, as a temptation to worldly sorrow for the world, to surrender to its sadness and despondency. And as He thrice repelled Satan from Him in the wilderness, when he assailed Him by the enticements of the lust of the world, so must He thrice wrest Himself as a victor from the temptation of Satan which attacks Him with the misery and with the anguish of the world.

Moreover, we know finally also, that in every actual experience Jesus looks beyond, not only past the guilt of the world, but also past the cunning of hell, to the government of God, embracing and appointing everything that is done; and that to Him the ordering of God, even the most painful, remains continually the ordering of His Father; and that here also this glory of His divine consciousness abides, is proved by the expression

[1] See my treatise, *Worte der Abwehr*, p. 45.

with which He characterizes the sorrow that is coming over Him. He calls it a cup—a cup, indeed, filled with the bitterest draught, but *still a cup*, which the hand of the Father has formed perfectly as a cup is formed, which it has filled, which it offers to Him. Thus He also wholly feels that the Father allows this experience to come upon Him.

The Father allows Him here to shudder and to sweat with anguish before the eyes of His confidential disciples, as He had formerly glorified Him before their eyes. And, indeed, He must undergo this on account of His connection with men. When He had wholly got the better of Himself in His Spirit,—and thus for Himself alone, in peace, yea in triumph, could have given up the world,—there appeared, in conformity with His love to the world, in conformity with His connection with humanity, the deepest suffering—pure compassion about the world, for the world. He thus experienced, in the most peculiar sense, the sorrow of the world in His soul. But as the appointment of God, this sorrow of the world is now, according to its inmost nature, nothing but the judgment of God upon the world. Thus Jesus also experienced in Gethsemane really the judgment of God upon the world in its terrible greatness, as it came upon Him in its spiritual rhythmic process in that storm of the catastrophe which the religious sentiment calls the anger of God,[1] with the same

[1] Those who attack the doctrine of God's wrath have not only to contend with the Old Testament, but also with the New, *e.g.*, with the passage Rom. i. 18. And not only with the New Testament itself, but also with the everlasting operation of the government of the divine righteousness, which corresponds to it. The rule of righteousness is revealed as wrath in the rhythmic process of development which it supposes in the substance of life in nature and history, even to the revelation of the critical catastrophe (ἀποκαλύπτεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ) in its victorious contest with the sin striving against it. The most simple religious glance must everywhere acknowledge this objectivity. To such catastrophes belong perhaps altogether peculiarly the moments in which the world, according to God's righteous judgment, advanced on its perverted way in sorrow and despondency. If Jesus thus experienced in Gethsemane, in the power of His sympathy, the sorrow and the despondency of the world, He thus experienced the wrath of God upon the world—certainly not as God's wrath against Him. Besides, it is to be observed that the conception of wrath entirely corresponds with the conception of mercy; and that if the one is violated, so is the other also. Yea, if all that is purely human is capable of glorification by means of the divine, yet those who wish not to know of divine wrath, must find human wrath in all forms objectionable. But

justice as the religious spirit characterizes it as the zeal or the energy of His righteousness.

And this experience, in its mysterious greatness, it was which so strongly affected the Lord, that He prayed the Father if it could be possible that He would let this bitter cup of sorrow pass from Him. It was His anxiety in this necessity not to fail, but to assert His confidence in the Father; love to mankind in this anguish not to stand tremblingly before His disciples, as if He were a criminal who trembled at approaching judgment, as He appeared to be, in consequence of the infinite sympathy with the criminal, guilt-laden race. But especially, He felt that in this mind He must not appear before the enemies. Thus, that was the cup for whose removal Jesus prayed, but which He declared Himself to the Father ready to drain even to the dregs; but it was not the sorrows of His death itself. This is intimated in Matthew, by the expression of Jesus' prayer: If this cup may not pass from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done. But the Evangelist Mark declares still more distinctly the whole solicitude of the contest of Jesus in this sense, in remarking that Jesus prayed the Father that *this hour*, if it were possible, might pass from Him. Thus He cannot have meant His death-suffering itself, but only that hour of His temptation. Thus the prayer of Christ is similar to that earlier one in an earlier temptation (John xii. 27), where also the petition fell from His lips that the hour might pass from Him. Finally, it is also to be considered, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews (v. 7) it is said that Jesus had offered up prayers and supplications with strong

this is extremely uncertain. It is, however, undoubted that the divine wrath is not to be considered as human affection. This is true, moreover, of the conception of love, etc., transferred to God. Finally, we must still make the fact prominent, that that is strictly *the conception of the wrath which expresses the unity of the righteousness of God with His life and with His love.* [On this comp. Augustin, *De Trinitate* vi. 4–7. Turretin says (*De Satisfactione Christi* ii. 5): 'Justitia et Misericordia non sunt duæ res in Deo nedum contrariæ, sed una eademque Dei essentia quæ secundum objecta et effecta diversa distinguitur, non in se, sed respectu nostri, diciturque Misericordia cum liberat miseros, Justitia cum judicat reos.' As to whether our Lord felt the wrath of God against Him, see Witsius, *Animadversiones Irenicæ*, cap. iii. It is there said, 'If by an offended and an angry mind, you mean a holy will to punish, Christ the Lord felt and bore the displeasure of God, and the weight of His wrath in the punishment of our sins, which were translated to Him.'—Ed.]

crying and tears, *and had been heard* (*and delivered*) from that which was His fear. This passage has with reason been referred to the transaction in Gethsemane. But at the same time should have been considered the exactness with which that transaction is here indicated. Jesus thus also actually drank the cup after His words of submission; and thus also the cup still passed away from Him, according to His prayer for its being turned away: for actually, by virtue of His *drinking* the cup, drinking it with the purest feeling of human sorrow in it, with the purest resistance to the satanic temptation in it, and with the purest surrender to the government of God in it, it thereby passed away. He suffered this appointment patiently three times as the decree of the Father; three times He underwent it trembling and praying, as the sorrow of humanity; thence He endured it as the temptation of Satan; and in the measure in which He accomplished this surrender in the contest, and this contest in the surrender, sorrowing and struggling, the bitterness of His sorrow was changed into pure peace of soul. Thus He attained the blessing of this victory. First of all, for instance, the *immoveable* FIRE-PROOFNESS *of heart against all storms, sorrows, and pangs which still awaited Him.* His soul was now established in the assurance of His Spirit against His death. But that struggle and victory in Gethsemane was, moreover, advantageous to humanity. Herein Jesus won for the spiritual life, especially of His people, an eternal peace—the power of bearing all the attacks of the world upon their sensibility, all the pains of renunciation, all the experiences of oppression and desertion in the world, all the woes of love and of honour—every suffering in respect of life and love—every anxiety of death and of judgment in the presence of God—of glorifying these things in His light—of accepting them from His hand, consecrated and blessed as a cup prepared and accredited by Him; and thereby of overcoming them, or rather of converting them into a fire of proof, *that they might become firm in heart against every tempest of life, of death, and even of hell.*

We can only very imperfectly figure to ourselves the significance of the soul-passion of Christ in Gethsemane, and the representation of this significance falls even shorter still of the suggestion of its entire importance. But we may say, with many who have already expressed the same thought, that Christ

was never greater than actually in the struggle and victory of His soul in Gethsemane. The tranquillity of soul wherewith Socrates drank off his cup of poison has been referred to, in order to represent it as strange that Jesus did not face death in His calm manner equally. Stoic spirits have exulted, with a side-glance to this fearful presentiment of Christ, at the contempt of death with which they have met death generally, or even execution.[1] And thus even believing Christians also have sought to explain the great exultation with which individual martyrs have died, only on dogmatic grounds, from the fact that Christ in His contest had first of all to earn the reconciliation of the world for us; while such martyrs could pass and die in the peace of this reconciliation. But in all this it has been totally forgotten that the conception of the harmonious greatness of man demands that he should also have a great heart,—that thus the holy Son of man must be the Prince of humanity, even in the power of holy experience,—that He must be able, in an individual sense, to take up into Himself the consciousness of His whole race, to stand there in the perfected sympathy with humanity, and to tremble with it, and for it, as no other man could. How far, then, does the Lord's power of feeling transcend that of a Socrates—yea, even transcend His forebodings of feeling, without mentioning that the proud ironical philosopher would hardly have been able to open his heart, in the pulsation of anguish, to his scholars as Jesus revealed Himself to His disciples! And how many have met death thus poor in feeling, and therewith, even in the sense of life, benumbed by death even in life, or drunk with the vanity of life even in death, who in their self-delusion have regarded this state of mind as a peculiar triumph over death! In respect of the martyrs, it is true that the peace which characterized their death was founded upon the struggle and victory of Christ. But it must not be forgotten, in their case, that none of them died in any way with the vividness, spirituality, and depth of the world-embracing consciousness of Christ. As the death of a thoughtless child in a family is related to the death of a man, and that of the head of the house, so the death of Christians is related to the death of Christ; and thus a similar relation subsists between the presentiment of death as it appears in the case

[1] Strauss, ii. 428.

of the martyrs, and as it appears in Christ, apart from the many elements of enthusiastic excitement which to many a dying Christian have lightened the external circumstances of his death. But in all these comparisons the main point ought least of all to be left out of sight, namely, that Jesus in this case had not to do with the ordinary fear of death as such; but that a sense of death from the side of the world came over Him, which thrice upon the spot, even in the garden, appeared to wish to destroy Him, and that it was the temptation in this deadly-powerful sensation that He struggled with. How exalted in this contest must Christ be above the dying heroes of our race, is proved by the manifold circumstances which embittered the perceptions of that moment.

If now we would present to ourselves the mind of the Lord approximately, we must remember that all the developments of the nobler and deeper life of sentiment, as they continue to arise in humanity under the influence of Christianity, are to be considered as emanations of feeling out of that spring which began to flow in Christ. Even in its feeling, humanity was benumbed —dead! In Christ, first of all, this fountain began to gush forth once more in its original power: thus also it was in the feelings of pain and of suffering, as in the feelings of peace. Thus, also, every holy capability of feeling, of Christian humanity, leads us back to Gethsemane. We must further recall the bitterest thoughts of our heaviest and holiest hours, and still more the great attacks which the great God's heroes have endured in the decisive moments of their life. Thus we learn gradually to guess what was the import of the soul's passion of Christ in Gethsemane.

Moreover, His struggle gives us also the highest security that He led and closed His Redeemer-life in true faithful manhood and humanity. His human nature was distinguished from the divine. His life could be conscious to itself in a desire, a wish which expressed itself and represented itself as adverse to the will of God in His historical procedure, even although it was only to sacrifice itself to Him in fuller self-surrender. He was capable of suffering as man—capable of choice, and subject to temptation as man. And just because His ideally-pure divine-human nature had also an ideal will which pointed towards a paradisaically pure and blessed life (just as is the case

also approximately with the better ideals of sinful man), therefore His will must for ever be coming in opposition with the historical course of the world into which He was involved, and with the government of God therein. But immediately the will of God appeared to Him in this historical form of His government, and immediately He became conscious to Himself of this opposition between this will of God and His own will: this only occurred to fulfil the opposition in pure piety, that is, to lose His will in the will of the Father. Just for that reason, as the faithful High Priest, with supplication and tears, He could sacrifice His life and the volition of His ideally-pure life to the Father for the salvation of the world.[1]

The great acquisition of the Lord is at once proved by His being able to go through the long martyr course of His sufferings, with His feeling heart and tenderly holy life, in immoveable calmness and firmness, in a tranquillity which almost gives the impression of something spirit-like. This power shows itself at once in the lofty calmness with which He wakes up His disciples, and goes to meet His enemies.

NOTES.

1. On the brook Kidron, Robinson observes (i. 232), that it is throughout only a watercourse between high hills, and that the celebrated Kidron flows, and flowed probably even in earlier days, over its bed never but in the rainy season. Upon the spot which is indicated as the quondam Gethsemane: 'Passing down the steep hill from the gate (Stephen's Gate) into the valley of the Kidron, and crossing the bridge over the dry watercourse, one has on the left the half subterranean church of the Virgin Mary, with an excavated grotto or chapel called her tomb.' 'Near the same bridge and church, on the right, is the place fixed on by early tradition as the former garden of Gethsemane. It is a plat of ground nearly square, enclosed by an ordinary stone wall,

[1] Thus the history of the soul-passion of Jesus in Gethsemane has also a vast importance for general Christology. The separation of the monophysite and monothelite heresies from the doctrine of the Church finds here, as has been elsewhere observed, its strongest confirmation. At the same time, this place is of the greatest importance for Christian ethics. It testifies that 'heroical apathy does not belong to the original Christian ideal;' that rather 'the moral power of the Christian is the divine, which is mighty in human weakness.' See De Wette on Matt. 223.

etc. Within this enclosure are eight very old olive-trees, with stones thrown together around their trunks. There is nothing peculiar in this plat to mark it as Gethsemane; for adjacent to it are other similar enclosures, and many olive-trees equally old. (The story that the present trees are the same which stood here at the time of the Saviour, is of course a fable.[1]) From the bridge three paths lead up to the summit of the Mount of Olives: one, a mere footpath, strikes up in a direct course along a steep projecting part of the hill; a second passes up more circuitously to the left, where the hill retires a little, and has a more gradual slope; and the third winds up along the face farther south. The sides of the mountain are still sprinkled with olive-trees, though not thickly, as was probably the case of old, and a few other trees are occasionally seen. I took the middle path, which brought me out at the church of the Ascension and the mosque, situated on the summit. Around them are a few huts, forming a miserable village. Here one is able to look down upon the city, and survey at least the roofs of the houses.' At the place where Christ must have undergone His contest, a grotto is pointed out. This spot lies to the left from the Kidron bridge, opposite the olive garden, situate to the right of it.—Schubert, ii. 517.

2. Upon the contradictions which Strauss wishes to have found in the account of the soul-passion of Jesus in the several Evangelists, compare Hase, 237; Hug, ii. 143; W. Hoffmann, 386; Ebrard, 416. The latter rightly calls attention to the fact, that Strauss's assertion that Luke says our Lord *only* prayed *once*, is set aside by the words in Luke, according to which a gradation appeared in the prayer of Jesus. To that, according to our representation, may be added the significance of the strengthening by the angel in Luke.

3. On the blood-like sweat of Jesus, Hug observes (ii. 145), 'That thereupon might have been consulted Theophrastus de Sudoribus, p. 456, edit. Heinsii in Wetstein. (Here follows the quotation word by word, then the translation.) There is thus a clear and a dense sweat. The first, originating externally, is watery and clear; the other, coming from a depth, is

[1] 'Since Josephus declares that Titus in the siege had all the trees in the region round the city cut down to a distance of a hundred stadia.'—Tischendorf.

heavier, almost as if there were flesh become liquid mixed with it.' Thus also some assert that it had similarity to blood; as Monas the physician says, 'as if, for instance, it had drawn humours out of the veins.' Hug adds, 'It is thus the blood-like and thick and heavy sweat, on account of which it ran down upon the ground.' To the question, 'How the disciples from the distance and in the night could observe the down-falling of bloody drops on the body of Jesus?' Hug retorts, 'Mr Doctor, at the Israelitish Passover the full moon always shines every year at Jerusalem. As often then as Jesus rose from prayer and went to the disciples, they could see it, and the easier in proportion as the drops of sweat were larger.' [The passages referred to in Ebrard (as above), and which appear to authenticate instances of bloody sweat, are also cited from the German *Ephemerides* by Dr Stroud, in his work, '*A Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*,' p. 383. The most remarkable recorded instances of this phenomenon are there given at length, and lead to the conclusion that violent mental agitation, and especially the fear of death, may occasion a bloody sweat. The instances are certainly few, and in some cases perhaps scarcely authenticated. Maldonatus, *e.g.*, did not (as Ebrard affirms) *see* an instance of it in Paris, but only says, 'Audio de his qui viderunt aut cognoverunt ante annos duos, Lutetiæ Parisiorum, hominem robustum et bene valentem, audita in se capitali sententia, sudore sanguineo fuisse perfusum.' Yet Dr Stroud and other eminent medical authorities think that the occurrence of the phenomenon is both sufficiently established, and that it can be accounted for on known physical laws. But there are many (as Bynæus, ii. 133–5) who admit the possibility of such an occurrence, but deny that the words of the Evangelists require, or even allow us to suppose, that it happened in the case of our Lord. As the work of Bynæus is not always at hand, his conclusion may be quoted: 'Si enim summus inde mœror angorque perspicitur, quod Jesus sudasse sanguinem dicitur, aut sanguineum sudorem, etiam ex hoc videri potest admodum luculenter, extrema ipsius anxietas, diraque et insolita consternatio, quod sudor emanaverit tanta cum copia, ut grandibus guttis, quales solent esse sanguineæ, defluxerit in terram, cum sudor neutiquam homini, nisi anxio atque perturbato incredibilem in modum, erumpat tam vehementer, præsertim ubi

solus, et sub dio, idque media nocte est, et nocte tam frigida, qualis hæc fuit ut ignem accendere necesse sit, uti a servis atque ministris in aula Caiaphæ factum.'—ED.]

4. [Ellicott shrinks from asserting 'the *punitive* withdrawal of the Paternal presence' from our Lord in Gethsemane (p. 328, note), and refers the bitterness of this cup to 'the vivid clearness of the Saviour's knowledge of the awful affinity between death, sin, and the powers of darkness.' Ought we not rather to maintain that the whole suffering of our Lord was of a punitive nature? From first to last He was our substitute; and whatever throughout His life He did or endured, had virtue towards God in our behalf. But His suffering could not have been thus expiatory without being also penal. For where there is no punishment, there can be no expiation. And while, therefore, we account for this or that pain and sorrow of our Redeemer, and explain the natural causes which produced the suffering endured by Him, we are not to leave out of account the higher and final cause of His suffering, nor to exclude the punitive infliction of God. It was because in one form or another the Lord was 'bruising' Him that He suffered; and the moment that we remove the punitive hand of God from Him, we make His bitter pains superfluous. If their cause was not the punitive justice of God, our justification (at the bar of that justice) cannot be their effect.

The great difference between the statements of recent writers and those of the older theologians regarding the passion of our Lord, seems to be, that the latter dwelt with greater emphasis on the effect of His suffering, while the former are accustomed to bring out with greater prominence the constituent elements of His suffering. The earlier writers exhausted the doctrine of Christ's substitution, and have left later investigators little to do except to analyze this connection of Christ with humanity, as it was actually exhibited in His person and life. Perhaps the former considered too little the personal and individual aspects of that life in which they saw a mediatorial work; perhaps the latter confine themselves too exclusively to the demonstration of the human interests and natural feelings of our Lord, and induce us to forget the divine connections which ruled His life: *e.g.*, we are told in Dr Hanna's recent volume, *The Last Day of our Lord's Passion* (p. 236), that Christ entered into a connection with human sin mainly by 'realizing, as He only could, its extent, its inveteracy,

its malignity;' and that all this vast iniquity being present to His thoughts, as that of those with whom He was most closely connected, He was seized with the momentary apprehension that in Himself the death due to such iniquity was about to be realized. Now, no doubt there must have been some process of His soul by which He was brought into real contact with the sin of the world. His wide perception enabled Him to realize it, His holy nature was horror-struck in view of it; and being man, He felt shame for His race, as a father feels shame for a guilty family. This was the natural result of His position in this world; so that whether He had come to expiate these sins or no, His feelings would have been profoundly sorrowful. But surely we must take into account that feeling which must have been predominant in the human soul of our Lord, that He was in this world for the purpose of being the sacrifice for sin; that it was not a fanciful but a real connection which He had with sin; and that the death He was to die was not the happy and easy translation due to His innocent life and holy nature, but was a sinner's death, a 'cursed' death. Without taking into account this feeling, we not only do not apprehend the relation which our Lord's suffering bore to the punitive justice of the Father, but we do not apprehend those human feelings which existed in His soul, and were due, as natural results, to the circumstances in which He was placed in this world. Throughout He had to do with sin, not merely as existing in His presence, but in opposition to Himself. It was He alone who was to do away with all this sin around Him, and all other sins, of which what He saw was but a minute proportion; the greatest of them He was to bear the curse of, the least of them deserved a punishment which none but He could bear. The sins He saw daily accumulating in the world around Him,—all bore reference—a reference of how portentous a character!—to Himself. The children becoming hardened and used to sin, their seniors satiated with common iniquity, and inventing new forms of wickedness; —these were *His people* whom He had come to save from their sins; these were the future inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.

On the expiatory character of the sufferings in Gethsemane, see two remarkably eloquent and satisfactory paragraphs in Witsius, *De Œcon. Fed.* II. vi. 12 and 13.—Ed.]

SECTION IV.

JESUS IN GETHSEMANE IN THE PRESENCE OF HIS ENEMIES. THE TRAITOR. THE VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF JESUS TO BE MADE PRISONER. THE CONFIDENCE OF THE DISCIPLES, AND THEIR FLIGHT.

(Matt. xxvi. 47–56; Mark xiv. 43–52; Luke xxii. 39–46; John xviii. 1–12, 13.)

Hardly had the Lord awakened His disciples for the last time, and announced to them that the traitor was at hand, before the traitor himself appeared in that sacred place. 'Lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came,' says Matthew, in that form of expression in which the Evangelists are accustomed to relate the most extraordinary event. He came, and with him a great multitude, armed with swords and staves, sent by the Sanhedrim, the high priests, and elders of the people.

John describes this appearance somewhat circumstantially. Judas also, he observes, which betrayed Him, knew the place; for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with His disciples. This remark hints at the way in which Judas had employed his time after his departure from the company of the disciples. While Jesus completed the celebration of the Lord's Supper, took leave of His disciples, commended them to His Father in prayer, and wrestled with death in Gethsemane, he pursued, under the shelter of night, the black work of treachery. He hurried to the chiefs of the Sanhedrim, and told them that the suitable moment had now arrived. His vehemence inflamed the calculating wickedness of the crafty old men; they agreed to his proposition. But some time necessarily elapsed before they had become of one mind—before they had raised the temple-watch[1]—before they had obtained from the Roman governor his assent to their

[1] *Vide* Luke xxii. 52. 'There were Levitical temple-watches, and a captain of them, στρατηγός, etc., but hardly several στρατηγοί.'—De Wette, *zu Luk.* 105. The circumstance of Luke's speaking, Acts iv. 1, of the στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ in the singular number, gives us to suppose that he probably knew why he used the plural in the Gospel, doubtless to indicate subordinate officers of the temple-watch in union with their chief.

proposed arrest, and the requisite escort for their expedition. Judas had counted on this loss of time. And he thus came to the conclusion, that after the end of this time Jesus would be found in Gethsemane. It appears, moreover, from all the narratives, that the preparation which, in union with Judas, the high priests made, was considerable, not to say exaggerated. According to John, Judas brought with him the Roman cohort (*σπεῖρα*). Although this cannot be understood in its literal meaning, since usually only one Roman cohort lay in the castle of Antonia,[1] and such an one consisted of five hundred men; yet it must still be supposed that the troops of the Roman garrison that were disposable on the moment were employed in a body for this service—a portion of the cohort which might sufficiently represent it. Probably John, in his expression, 'Judas took the cohort,' means to convey, that it was he who induced the high priests to apply for so unlimited a defensive force. This is what we might also gather from Mark's account, according to which Judas recommended to his companions to take away the prisoner very carefully after they had taken Him (*ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς*). As well the former crafty calculation as the present exceeding carefulness, gives us a glimpse into the demoniacal agitation of the traitor. In the very midst of his treason to Jesus, he was aware that he had to do with a powerful being.[2] Moreover, it is easily understood that the Jewish rulers must have found it entirely to their interest to ask for a strong military force. The higher in this respect they pressed their claims on Pilate, and gave them force with the representation that they were engaged in the taking prisoner of a very dangerous man, the more would Jesus be rendered an object of suspicion beforehand with the Roman authority, before which they must still bring Him, if they wished to accomplish His death. Neither, perhaps, were they wholly without anxiety lest the followers of

[1] See Friedlieb, 67.

[2] It has been supposed that he spoke the words, 'Lead Him away carefully,' to the armed men ironically, foreseeing that they certainly would fail to do so. But this supposition is of a piece with the unfounded hypothesis, that Judas, by his treason, only wished to compel the Lord to appear with His power. It might indeed be possible, that even this possibility might have been an element in his temptation, and have formed the grounds of his self-excusing and self-confusion. And so far an ironical impulse may have flashed through that warning word of his.

Jesus should make an attempt to rescue Him. This excessive carefulness is evident from the fact, that the expedition was provided with torches and lamps. But for what purpose, then, were these lights, in a night lighted up by a full moon? They furnish a clear testimony to the historical character of the fact, showing, as they do, how accurately these bailiffs were acquainted with the rocky valley of the Kidron. There fell there great deep shadows from the declivity of the mountain and projecting rocks; there were there caverns and grottoes,[1] into which a fugitive might retreat; finally, there was probably a garden-house or towers, in whose gloom it might be necessary for a searcher to throw light around. Nevertheless, this precaution also, as well as the one formerly mentioned, is declared by its result to be entirely fruitless; and its pompousness would be laughable, if it had not arisen from a great and evil designedness. This premeditated purpose the Lord saw through at once. They sought, by the greatness of the parade, to render Him suspicious, and to destroy Him beforehand.

A similar exaggeration of caution is evident in the agreement which Judas made with the armed men—that he would point out the man for whom they were seeking by a kiss. It would appear that he might have accomplished his treachery quite simply; but this is only appearance. The same spirit of mental confusion which made him a traitor, led him likewise to this devilish refinement—to this unheard-of combination of the disciple's kiss with the traitor's sign, which has no parallel in the world's history—to this highest, most pointed expression of the diabolical declension from God and Christ, in which the most cunning wit degenerates into the most brutal stupidity, and in which, so far, the serpent's bite finds its most accurate human copy. No, assuredly the Church could never have invented the kiss of Judas—no evangelistic mind could have fabricated it; only he who gave it could have thought upon it.

Thus the company which approached towards Jesus was prepared in every way in the character of diabolical exaggeration. And if, on the one hand, the temple-watch and the Roman soldiers gave a legal air to the expedition, this was not in the

[1] One might easily find a certain relation between these torches and lamps, and the tradition according to which Jesus is said to have undergone His struggle of soul in a grotto.

least degree qualified by the addition to them of the germs of the popular tumult which was subsequently excited against Jesus—individual fanatics, as may be gathered from the characterization of the crowd as a multitude of people,[1] as well as from the circumstance that many were armed with staves or clubs.

In the most definite manner Mark tells us that Judas suddenly appeared in the background of the garden, in which Jesus had just brought to themselves the three disciples who had been overwhelmed with sleep. In affected haste he hurried to the Lord with the words, 'Hail, Rabbi!' which, according to Mark, he uttered with apparent affection, naming Him Rabbi, Rabbi, and immediately attempted to give to Him the traitor's kiss. Luke appears to intimate that this kiss did not entirely reach Jesus (ver. 47).[2] And this is explained by the situation. Jesus anticipated those who were hastening towards Him, by offering Himself, of His own accord, to meet the crowd (according to John) with the clear foresight of what was before Him. Thus the two must meet one another; and as Judas sought to lay hold of the Lord in order to kiss Him, He cast to him the reproachful word, 'Friend, wherefore art thou come? Dost thou wish to betray the Son of man with a kiss?' We can only regard the meeting as a passing moment, in which the Lord, stepping back and rebuking the traitor, unmasked, and, so to speak, shook him off in order to hasten forward; for, according to John, He must have met the crowd as they were entering into the garden (ἐξελθὼν). We may conceive, perhaps, from John's account, wherefore He hastened thus. In the foreground of the garden the rest of the disciples waited for Him; and He wished just as little to expose them, as the three, to the attack of the enemies,

[1] Respecting the ὄχλος, Hug observes with reason (ii. 152), 'We are not to be surprised at the appellation, a multitude, or at its equipment. The case is entirely historical. No armed body of men was granted to the high priests and the Sanhedrim, as, for example, there was to Herod and Philip. They had only servants, ὑπηρέτας, for the maintenance of the temple police, and similar purposes.'

[2] Also the choice of the expression καταφιλεῖν in the other Evangelists is probably, in any case, qualified to intimate the surprising by a kiss which occurred in this place. [There seems ground for supposing that the compound is used to signify a more tender kiss than is denoted by the simple word. See Meyer and Ellicott. Alford, however, says it is 'only another word for ἐφίλησεν, and not to be pressed.'—Ed.]

but to take up such a position as fitly secured them. Thus it is explained, from the simplest combination of the several Evangelists in the lively representation of the moment, that the kiss of Judas became, in its result, an altogether needless devilish farce; that its purpose was frustrated partially by the eagerness of the traitor himself, partially by the quick resolution with which Jesus pushed him on one side, in order to cover and to save His company by offering Himself to the enemies almost at the entrance of the garden.

John holds this view *à priori* of the faithfulness of Jesus to deliver His disciples so strongly, that he is able to omit the kiss of Judas as a disturbing interpolation. Even the question, Whom seek ye? with which Jesus met the watch, had the purpose of placing the disciples in security, compelling His pursuers thoroughly to understand that their instruction was limited only to taking Him prisoner. And this object He perfectly attained.[1] They answered, Jesus of Nazareth. Thus they substantially renounced all rightful claim to the taking prisoners the disciples. 'I am He,' answered the Lord. This word, spoken in the calmness of His spiritual majesty, made immediately a startling impression upon the crowd. At this moment Judas was already back among the people. He must have hastened back quickly upon the sharp rebuke of Christ. Probably by this hasty retreat also he threw the first element of sympathetic terror into the mass, which now fully developed itself at the saying of Christ. At the word, I am He, they went backward and fell to the ground! The night, the locality, and the throng, favoured the impression which the firm appearance of Christ made on those beating hearts, among whom the Jews were trembling at the possibility that they might have to do with a great prophet, while the heathens must be awed with the thought that perhaps a son of the gods was before them. Who could have inquired, in the spectacle of that wavering, stumbling, and thronging coil of men, whether the mass, man for man, fell down to the ground? Nay, it is to be gathered plainly, that in so dense a crowd there must

[1] Hug supposes (ii. 153) that Jesus wished to compel the temple captains to name His name (by the question, Whom seek ye?), that so He might be known to the servants who attended them as blind instruments, because usually an anonymous person brought in in the night might easily be put on one side and disappear without trace.

have been some who could not have fallen to the ground at all. But all the more for that reason the view became prominent, for which John alone is responsible, that the crowd as a crowd was stricken, was weakened, and recoiling, fell down headlong.[1]

The effects of sympathetic fear are entirely incalculable, just as are the effects of sympathetic desire or enthusiasm.[2] Moreover, they are enhanced in proportion as the feeling of slavish awe, of piety, of conscientious reverence, is increased in the terrified person towards the object which fills him with terror. Thus great men even have often infused fear, in the most helpless circumstances, into those who wished to attack them, merely by the fact of accosting them calmly. One of the best known examples is that of Marius, who placed the soldier who sought to kill him in fear and confusion.[3] But in a special manner always might those who have the consciousness of a bad cause be unexpectedly overcome by the giant of terror, even although a visible judge of their daring does not stand before them, to say nothing of the very person whom they are about to outrage seeming to meet them as an avenger. But the present moment in this respect stands alone in the world's history. The involuntary performers of the vilest office, with the dark consciousness of that wickedness which is making them its tools, deep in the night, deep in the shadows of the rocky valley of Kidron, find themselves suddenly confronted with the man whose name has long had for them a mysterious significance, in whom some among them reverence the greatest performer of miracles. Moreover, at the moment when Jesus spontaneously met them, they must have thoroughly felt the terrible spiritual power of His majesty,—the more terrible the less able they are to explain to themselves this impression.

It might have happened to them that Christ should have produced this effect of astonishment in them without purposing

[1] When Neander thus regards the matter that a part of the troops have amazedly cast themselves down upon the ground, the original representation is not, perhaps, maintained in its integrity.

[2] We refer here to the great theatre of such sympathies which the Catholic middle ages offer, as it is enlivened by the crusaders, the pilgrims, boy-processions, flagellators, dancers, and such like.

[3] Other examples are given in Tholuck upon John, 380. Although the last, concerning Coligny, is laid claim to by Strauss (ii. 458), nothing is thereby determined against the whole family of such facts.

it, merely by meeting them. But certainly He was designedly conscious of this influence. He wished and needed by this act not only to prove His innocence in His glory in the face of His enemies, but also to make known the freedom with which He surrendered Himself to the representatives of the Old Testament law, and still more to the decree of the Father. Besides, this manifestation served to further the security of the disciples, which He had in view. If it be now debated whether the effect produced by Christ was a miracle or a natural but extraordinary occurrence, this question commonly proceeds upon a false estimation of the miraculous in the life of Jesus on the one hand, and of the natural on the other. As the customary wonders of Jesus are brought about by spontaneous faith, this is brought about by the compulsory faith or partial superstition of those who were opposed to Him. It is very natural that these men must fall tremblingly to the ground at the word of His heavenly dignity and power. But none the less is it a miracle, that He thus casts them down with a flash of His word. Thus His word had often before filled His adversaries with paralyzing fear, in moments in which they sought to take Him.[1] In this last case, however, He produced a most powerful effect on His opponents; the impression which He made upon them announced in His personality the future Judge of the world.

This wondrous influence of Christ upon His enemies, moreover, is especially calculated to throw light upon the picture which the world continually represents of Him to itself, and most of all when it persecutes Him. It is the curse of its unbelief that it is compelled always thus to look upon Him with slavish superstition, in dark, threatening, gigantic form, in the character of an avenger threatening destruction. The persecutors here appear to us in this delusion. To them Christ is a gloomy form of terror. They think that He comes for destruction upon them. In His word, 'I am He,' they fancy they already perceive the terror of the last judgment. Still Jesus appears with His second question, 'Whom seek ye?' to call forth an opposite and consoling result. They gather themselves together, and answered as above. But He now brings out the purpose of His conversation with them in a marked manner. 'I have told you that I am He. If ye then seek Me, let these go their way.'

[1] *Vide* Luke iv. 30; John vii. 44, viii. 59, x. 39; Matt. xxi. 46.

John felt thoroughly how faithfully He had thus taken His disciples into His protection. He says that this happened that so the word of Jesus which He had spoken (in the high-priestly prayer) might be fulfilled: 'Of those whom Thou hast given Me have I lost none.' The Evangelist, in looking back upon this circumstance, knew best how closely in this case were linked together the external and the spiritual deliverance of the disciples, how much the latter was conditioned on the former; or, in other words, how little capable the disciples were at that time to go with Jesus to death. Thus he knew also that the delivering faithfulness of Jesus to His people had in this moment crowned His work; that thus also that word of Jesus, that He has kept His own, found here its last fulfilment and confirmation.[1]

When, after the last word of Jesus, the watch again pressed forward to take Him prisoner, the disciples saw at length what was intended (*ἰδόντες τὸ ἐσόμενον*, Luke 49), and Peter stepped forward, with the question, 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?' The reproaches of the Lord about his sleepiness still pressed heavily upon his heart; the word of Jesus, 'Let these go their way,' might likewise wound and excite him. Finally, moreover, he saw how preparation was being made to bind his Master. Without waiting for the reply of Jesus, he drew his sword and struck among the crowd. From the circumstance of his striking the high priest's servant, by name Malchus, we may conclude that the said Malchus was among the foremost; and this, perhaps, suggests a proof that the high priest had stirred up his people to the utmost against Jesus. The mischievous blow of the disciple, however, had only struck the right ear of Malchus. Of what nature the wound was, it is difficult to decide. The Evangelists all agree that he cut off his ear. Luke relates besides,[2] that Jesus, with the words, 'Suffer ye thus far,' which probably must have been addressed to the watch, who were just on the point of taking Him into custody,[3] touched the ear of the wounded man and healed it again. Thence, pro-

[1] Schweizer finds an interpolation here, *Das. Evang. John*, s. 63. Compare, on the other hand, vol. i. p. 211.

[2] Upon the relation of this passage to the fact that Luke was a physician, see above, vol. i. p. 265.

[3] According to others, these words were addressed to the disciples in the sense, Let that be sufficient; or, So far and no further! Against this view

bably, it results that the ear was not wholly cut off. It is sufficient if it would have been lost for the wounded man, unless Jesus had saved it for him. Hereupon He turned to Peter with the commanding word, 'Put up thy sword into the sheath: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Or thinkest thou perchance that I cannot *now* (even still and now) pray to the Father for help, and He would give Me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then should the Scriptures be fulfilled? Thus must it be.' According to John, He uttered the last thought more fully: 'The cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?'

Peter had shown with his first blow that he was no warrior; fortunately he had made a false cut. But it is very significant that he struck exactly the ear of Malchus. It has always been the ear, the spiritual hearing, the ready receptiveness, of which the secularized servants of Christ deprived their adversaries, when they have had recourse to the sword of force. Equally significant is it that Christ asks for Himself one more moment of freedom from the enemies, in order that He may do themselves good. Thus he always continues to interpose with dignified and divine serenity between prejudiced enemies and prejudiced friends. He alone remedies the faults of His people against the enemies; He re-establishes the susceptibility of the better ones among His antagonists, much injured as it has been by His followers, in consequence of immature fanatical proceedings. But He teaches His friends to renounce every appeal to force in the concerns of His kingdom. Those who take the sword perish with the sword. This is not only true of rebels, but especially also of fanatical champions of the interests of Christ's kingdom; yea, it is a canon which, finally, is true in the most general sense for all human warfare. It might also be said that this is a maxim of all spheres of right, of ecclesiastical right as of political right, of private right as of the right of war, only that the maxim is everywhere modified, and that everywhere it is only to be applied to a wilful seizing of the sword of violence. But for the Church there is in this word a solemn

is the fact that, after the healing, Jesus admonishes the disciple. In the first place, the healing itself was reproof enough. In this case, however, Christ must ask for a delay from the enemies, since He had already surrendered Himself to them.

warning and threatening,—especially for that Church which calls itself by the name of Peter. The Lord not only rejects the help of the sword in His cause, because it is opposed to the spirit of His kingdom, but also because in its own nature it is completely doubtful. The sword of force calls forth the sword of force; and thence arises an earthly secular struggle, in which the risk of the result may waver between one side and the other. But it is otherwise with the superiority of which Jesus is assured.

Even in the present difficult situation He knows thoroughly that He could discover the mightiest supremacy against the enemies, if it were consistent now to break off the œconomy of patience, of grace, and of mercy, and to reckon with the hostile world in judgment. Then He might quickly call forth a great change. He might ask for Himself the highest miraculous help from the Father; He might in a moment obtain the richest development of the might of His heavenly kingdom against the evil. Instead of poor confused disciples, He might oppose to the enemies angels of heaven; instead of the little company of the twelve, of whom one was already fallen away, twelve complete legions.[1] But no, the Scriptures must be fulfilled before all things, even the Scriptures of His passion,—the Scriptures of the covenant of grace, and of the victory of the great divine Sufferer over the world.

This is, moreover, true also of every moment of the New Testament era. If it should be God's will that at any time the œconomy of grace, which operates through the holy cross, should be discontinued, the infinite supremacy of heavenly powers over the force of the enemy upon earth would in that moment be called forth and appear. But even so men would break off the work of salvation before its completion. And this is not to be so; and because it must not be so, it cannot be so. And if men wished it, they would thus tempt God, and summon up powers against the darkness, of which it would always become evident that they would not be angels of light from heaven, but disguised powers of darkness, which could only accomplish a deceiving show of struggle with the manifest powers of darkness. But over them the redeeming war which Christ carries on is infinitely exalted. Yea, in order to prosecute this strife, even

[1] The Roman legions consisted in early days of 3200 men, but they were increased until at length they were 6200 men strong.

the pure angels in heaven are not sufficient for Him,—still less the sinful disciples; only His holy cross is sufficient for that.

After this admonition of Jesus to His disciples, the adversaries surrounded Him, the watch with their captain and the Jewish servants. The hands which only a moment before had healed a sufferer in their midst, were bound as the hands of a criminal.

Still He had never more fully maintained His liberty than at the very moment when He was imprisoned and bound. He made one solemn protestation against the treatment which He must suffer. The conversation between Him and His guards had probably now lasted a long time. Thereupon some vehement members of the Sanhedrim, who were extraordinarily eager for the conclusion of the matter, might have easily lost patience and have sneaked after the guards, so as to appear just after the moment of the capture. Luke suggests this. There came now some dignified priestly persons into sight, officers of the temple, and elders.[1] To these Jesus addressed the rebuking word: 'Be ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take Me? I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye laid no hands upon Me to take Me prisoner. But this is your hour, and the power of darkness.'

First of all, He accuses their false and cowardly procedure, in which lies the proof of their evil doing, and of their evil consciousness. Partly, He seems to them as a criminal, because they in their mental obliquity must fear Him; partly they give themselves the air of thinking Him so, because they wanted to blacken Him beforehand by their parade of taking Him. Then He proves to them the clearness and the power of His innocence. He could appear daily in the temple; He could peacefully sit down there in the midst of their sanctuary; in the very heart of their power could there freely propound His doctrines to all people, and they never ventured to lay hand on Him, although they would willingly have done so often. Then He shows to them that it is they themselves who come out and behave in the way of criminals, under the shelter of night, in their alliance with the works of darkness. He appeared in their presence in the bright daylight, in the temple, as the prophet of God. They approached Him under the curtain of night, in deep secrecy, as the tools of the kingdom of darkness.

[1] See Ebrard, 419.

The last word is so great and important a saying, that in all probability it was expressed in this form out of the mouth of the Lord. It declares in a more concrete form the same thoughts which Matthew, and partially Mark, also record in a more usual manner. All this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. The last words probably Jesus added, in order to explain the more mysterious expression.

Thus also Jesus expresses the perfect clearness and composure with which He finds Himself in this situation. This is your hour. They have power over Him now. But this hour is the hour of darkness. Satan has power over them. But this power which Satan has over them, and through them over Him, he has only because it is given him by God, who, according to the old Scriptures, had decreed that Christ must once be reckoned among malefactors. And it is this power of God to which He surrenders Himself with free resignation, in submitting to their supremacy, which is only the power of one hour, and only a power of appearance appointed for that very purpose to condemn themselves.

With the last word of Jesus, the disciples knew with certainty that He would make no resistance to His being taken prisoner. Therewith crumbled the last strength of their hope of an earthly temporal kingdom of the Messiah. They felt it deeply as it crumbled; and the power of darkness which Jesus had named by name, asserted itself in their conduct, although the protecting word of Jesus had placed them in a position to withdraw peacefully in a united group. There came over them, nevertheless, an excitement of terror, as though they themselves were to be taken prisoners. They dispersed; they fled. Even although, in the literal meaning, it was not all of them that hastened from Him, yet subsequently they had a guilty consciousness when they looked back to this moment. They had not spiritually stood their ground.

It is deeply worthy of notice, that in those hours in which the officially called disciples for the most part so miserably withdrew from the Lord, other hidden disciples came forth more decidedly than heretofore as His—pious young men, faithful women, dignified Jewish councillors, as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea. Therein is manifested a special characteristic of the immortality of the Church of Christ—the fact that evermore,

as if out of the invisible, appear on the scene new disciples of Christ, when the old ones have retired, or appear to have done so. That young man of whom Mark speaks, gives us the first passing but very remarkable prelude of that fact. A certain young man, it is said, followed Him, having a linen cloth thrown around his naked body.[1] In that was revealed the fruit of an enthusiastic reverence for the Lord. The young man must have belonged to the dependants of Jesus.[2] He must have been asleep near the place where the capture occurred, and have been startled by the noise at night from his couch.[3] But as soon as he perceived that Jesus was being led away prisoner, he takes the boldest resolution without any calculation. Only loosely covered with a nightly garment, not dressed, he will follow Jesus into the city—rushing, as it appears, among the men, and into the bright light. Thus, again, there occurs to us here, in a mere isolated fact, a mere isolated symbol—to wit, the most lively image of those enthusiastic first beginnings of Christian excitement, in which the proud vibrations of youthful blood are mingled with the emotions of the spirit, as they sometimes cast themselves in the arena of battle, without becoming attire and inward preparation, and therewith afford to the adversaries of Christianity a shameful sport. Thus it happened here. The enthusiastic young man was seized by the young men, say several manuscripts, whereby, perhaps, the juvenile element in the whole character of this episode is slightly referred to; but he left his upper garment in the hands of the bailiffs, who would probably terrify him, and took to flight.

In this hour of darkness only *one* could stand victoriously against its power.

NOTES.

1. It is entirely in accordance with the subjective truth of

[1] The nightly vesture in which alone the Orientals are accustomed to sleep.—Friedlieb, 70.

[2] We have above (vol. i. p. 253) given the reasons why we suppose with some that this young man was John Mark.

[3] We might surely make a guess at the estate in Gethsemane itself, if we might express a conjecture as to the house in which the young man slept; and might connect with that, that the mother of Mark appears to have been a woman of respectable possessions; but we can only conjecture.

the Gospels, the Christian individuality of the view of the Evangelists, that not only in the history of the passion, but also in the history of the resurrection, the differences between the individual accounts appear more strongly. In both cases there is evident the agitation under which these individual occurrences of the Evangelists have severally formed and fixed themselves: in the narratives of the passion of Jesus, the tempest of distress; in the narratives of the manifestations of the risen Lord, the tempest of joy.

2. The question how the account of John, according to which Jesus made Himself known to the officers, is to be harmonized with that of the Synoptists, according to which He was pointed out to them by the kiss of Judas, has been sufficiently answered by Lücke, ii. 599; Hase, 135; Olshausen, iv. 179, by saying that the kiss of Judas occurred first of all; then that the Lord met the officers, in order to make Himself known to them. Strauss, on the other hand, observes: 'But if Judas had already pointed Him out with a kiss, and He had so well understood the purpose of the kiss, etc., He needed not especially to make Himself known, since He was already made known. To do it for the sake of protecting the disciples was just as superfluous, since He must observe in the traitorous kiss that it was designed to take Him away from His followers. He did it merely to show His courage—thus this was almost theatrical; but generally, that between the kiss of Judas and the intrusion of the crowd, which certainly followed immediately thereupon, Jesus should have met them with questions and addresses, manifests in His demeanour a hurry and precipitancy, which under these circumstances so ill becomes Him, that the Evangelists scarcely desire to attribute such a proceeding to Him.' It is strange that the critic has wholly overlooked in the figure of Judas the theatrical conduct,—the hurry and precipitancy which might so easily explain to him the supposed contradiction,—in order to find it in the appearance of Jesus as John depicts it.

3. 'It has been sought in many ways to explain why the Synoptists do not name Peter. That they did not wish to compromise the apostle, who was still living at the time of the writing of their Gospels, by naming his name, belongs to the rightly unrecognised fictions of a falsely pragmatical exegesis' (Strauss, ii. 460). With what justice is this supposition to be

exploded? This hypothesis must indeed be *reformed*, as well as the altogether kindred one concerning the silence about the raising of Lazarus in the Synoptists; and indeed, by the remembrance that the oral Gospel tradition, which was formed immediately after Pentecost, was always compelled to deal with facts such as those referred to with caution; and that omissions in this way became established, which subsequently became the guides of the Evangelists in the writing of their books.—(See vol. iii. p. 479.)

SECTION V.

JESUS BEFORE THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRIBUNAL OF THE JEWS. BEFORE ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS. THE FALSE WITNESSES. THE TRUE WITNESS, WITH THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT THAT HE IS THE SON OF GOD. THE SENTENCE OF DEATH. THE DENIAL OF PETER, AND HIS REPENTANCE. THE FIRST MOCKERY OF THE LORD. THE FINAL ECCLESIASTICAL DETERMINATION.

(Matt. xxvi. 57–75; Mark xiv. 53–72; Luke xxii. 54–71; John xviii. 13–27.)

The armed men that were sent were charged to lead the captive Jesus before the high priest. This duty was naturally discharged by the Jewish temple-watch. But they brought Him at first, not to Caiaphas, the officiating high priest, but to Annas, who had previously been the high priest, but had been removed by the Roman authority.

This, as we have already seen,[1] was entirely according to the theocratic feeling of legitimate right on the part of the Jews. They considered Annas as their real high priest; Caiaphas, on the other hand, they were compelled to acquiesce in, as the high priest 'of the year.' Moreover, very probably Annas, and Caiaphas, who was his son-in-law, were so settled in respect of their habitations, that this double play of the Jews with their two high priests was as little manifest as possible. Probably they

[1] Vol. iii. 484.

inhabited together the same high-priestly palace, and thus it might happen that the greatest part of the watch was waiting in the same hall of the house, while the locality of the judicial inquiry was changed. We are led to this assumption by the narrative of Peter's denial in John, in its relation to the account of the same circumstance in the synoptic Gospels. The fact also that the latter represent the Lord as being led away at once to Caiaphas, is explained on the like supposition.

John lays stress upon this previous examination, because it was decisive. He even hints as much in the remark, that Annas was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, and that Caiaphas was the high priest of the year; and that he was the same who gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for the people. After this introduction, it was not necessary that John should make any more account of the examination by Caiaphas; for he had already, by anticipation, pronounced the sentence of death upon Jesus. If Annas also came to the same decision, the business was already done. The high priest Annas put to the prisoner questions about His disciples and about His doctrine. In both respects He must give exact explanations. In this demand of the hoary inquisitor was involved the supposition that Jesus had a secret doctrine, and that He had delivered this to a secret society of dependants. This supposition Jesus by His answer rejects in the most decided manner. 'I have spoken openly to the world; I have ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing.[1] Why askest thou Me? Ask them which heard Me what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I said.' In these words, Jesus characterizes His teaching as the public and free expression of His life; and He points to the whole world as His school, both with perfect truth, but also with the most conscious exaltation of these two characteristics of His work, by which it is raised above all suspicions of secrecy. Rightly might Christ assert in this forensic sense that He had spoken nothing in secret; for even the confidential communications which He had made to the disciples, He had

[1] In spite of the similarity of this address to that which, according to Luke, He made to the men who arrested Him, it is evidently wholly distinct both in expression and tendency.

confided to them still with the view of their being made public. And when He called upon the high priest to ascertain from His hearers about His doctrine, He directed him not only in the more limited sense to His disciples, but to the people. Annas knew well that the whole people had been in the school of Jesus, and was filled with His words and deeds. But when Jesus challenged him to take the people into council, He directly reproved the malicious secrecy with which the high priests had taken Him prisoner in the night, and had withdrawn Him from the presence of the people, of the better people, in Israel.

It is nevertheless not to be denied that the answer of Jesus has a distinctly evasive form; and this perhaps is consistent with the fact that He was not willing to acknowledge the competency of this pharisaic hole-and-corner court of justice. If the Jews had publicly acknowledged Caiaphas, it was contrary to the truth to continue to receive in secret the high-priestly decrees from Annas. The attendants of Annas, in fact, appeared to take the answer of Christ as a refusal to recognise this authority: with fierce fanaticism they seem to have regarded the unexpected answer of Christ; for scarcely had He spoken, when one of the servants who stood near Him gave Him a blow with his hand on the face, with the words, 'Answerest thou the high priest so?' The reproof is entirely significant;[1] and just as keenly significant is the answer of Jesus: 'If I have spoken falsely, bring forward evidence of the falsehood; but if I have spoken truly, why smitest thou Me?' It was not a merely moral discussion that was in question here, but about the proof legally that Annas was the high priest.

Thus, in the preliminary examination, the first blow profaned the sacred countenance of the Lord, because He asserted the publicity of His doctrine and of His people, and would not recognise an uncalled, disorderly, hole-and-corner tribunal, which gained its authority from the wicked equivocation of His people. But in His sacred bearing and meek reproof of the fanatic, He remembered His own saying, Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the left also; and He taught how spiritually to understand and practise the injunction.[2]

[1] Paul underwent a similar maltreatment in Acts xxiii. 2.

[2] According to Jewish justice, maltreatments of a similar kind were prohibited under heavy penalties (Sepp, iii. 467). Spitting in the face, a sign

Annas now knew certainly that Jesus would endure no further speech with him. He sent Him therefore over to the official judgment-hall of Caiaphas. But his not allowing His bonds to be removed, but sending Him bound as He had been brought, conveyed to Caiaphas, an evident assurance that the deeply considered judgment of death was confirmed.[1]

At the court of the high priest Caiaphas were now assembled so many members of the Sanhedrim, that from the assembly a session of the Sanhedrim might be made. This gathering may be regarded as an unforeseen one, formed from the vehement opposers of Jesus.[2] Here again Jesus was brought to examination. But another proceeding was now adopted to convict Him of being guilty of death. The first time it was attempted to stamp Him as a secret teacher; this time the assumption was proceeded on, that, as an open teacher of error, He had said blasphemous things against the Jewish religion. They proceeded in a sarcastic manner upon His claim that they should inform themselves of His doctrine from His hearers, by bringing forward men who were to assert that they had heard scandalous words from His mouth. They sought thus to adduce false witnesses against Him. In fact, many willingly allowed themselves to be found to testify against Him: one would have heard this, and another that. Probably there were such misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the words of Jesus, as the Evangelists have frequently informed us of, which now were to be formally adopted as an accusation against Him. But as the witnesses appeared, their testimony melted into nothing: one thing contradicted the other (Mark, ver. 56), and thus they

of the deepest contempt, was punished with a fine of 400 drachmas (Friedlieb, 94). [The words of the law referred to are given by Bynæus, ii. 320, where there is also a collection of references showing the insult implied in spitting among the western nations, as well as in the east. Compare Num. xii. 14. He also tells us (ii. 267), that a blow with the open hand incurred the penalty of 200, with the fist of 400 drachmas. With reference to the precept Matt. v. 39, he justifies the conduct of Jesus on the ground that His silence under the blow might have been construed into a confession that He was in fault.—Ed.]

[1] Consequently the ἀπέστειλεν, ver. 24, needs not to be understood as the pluperfect.

[2] Sepp supposes (iii. 484) 'that the midnight session had only been opened by the little council of the three-and-twenty, or the members of the priesthood in the house of Caiaphas.

destroyed one another. The Lord looked on in silence, while the devices of His opponents thus came to nothing. The high priest was compelled to let drop many charges at once, from policy; for instance, all those which concerned the violation of the pharisaic institutions, in a narrower sense, on the part of Jesus, because otherwise the party of the Sadducees could very easily have been induced to make resistance.[1] At length came forward two men, who thought that they were certain of their case. They asserted that they had heard Him say, I can destroy the temple of God, and build it up again in three days. According to Mark, several came forward, and the accusation ran, I will destroy this temple, which is made with hands, and will in three days build up another, which is made without hands. The Evangelist adds, Even thus there was no unanimous testimony. Here he refers to another view of the testimony which he relates, as it probably occurs in Matthew. These people alluded to that word which Jesus had spoken two years before in the temple, by way of credentials of His purification of the temple. The word, in its simple form, as Jesus had spoken it, could not be used as an accusation, because it pointed to the Jews themselves, as the destroyers of the temple—to Himself, as Him who would build again the destroyed temple in a wonderful manner. But now, while they turned it about, they disagreed with one another. Some did not make the charge strong enough for the others, whose judgment Mark relates. The meaning of the accusation, indeed, was the same in all. Jesus must have threatened the temple, consequently the Israelitish religion, whose type the temple was,[2] with destruction. Even at these charges Jesus was silent, not only because they contradicted one another, but also because the Sanhedrim were fully aware that the witnesses were false.[3] How strongly this silence spoke, is shown by the impatience with which at length the high priest sprung up from his seat; and came forward into the middle of the hall to the accused, with the question, 'Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee?'

[1] Sepp, iii. 472; Acts xxiii. 7.

[2] Thus Stephen also, in Acts vi. 14.

[3] The Talmud specifies the manner in which the false witnesses were employed against the supposed false prophets. See the quotation in Sepp. iii. 467.

Jesus persisted in His silence. The wonderful effect of this silence disconcerted the inquisitor himself. For a while the judge confronted the accused as if he himself were condemned. It is felt that the official high priest, whom Jesus was to have stood before as a culprit, was himself the culprit. The assumed culprit revealed a dignity which attested the *real* High Priest. Finally, the judge actually set aside the greatest part of the false testimonies; only he continued to hold the appearance of thinking that Jesus had promised to build up the temple again in a marvellous manner—that in these words He had thus given Himself out for acknowledgment, as in other ways, as the Messiah, and indeed as Messiah in the highest sense, as the Son of God. Thus from that false testimony, apparently, he advanced at a bound to the very solemn appeal: 'I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of the Blessed!'

Jesus answered, 'I am!'[1]

He knew that this word, in which He declared His consciousness of His divine nature and of His heavenly dignity, brought death to Him. Nevertheless He declared it. He assented to the adjuration of the high priest with this acknowledgment; and thus He confirmed His statement of His consciousness, and mediately His whole doctrine, with a judicial oath, in the presence of death. He stood fast as the true, the faithful witness (Rev. i. 5), who here, and before Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession, as the great Prince of all martyrs—of all confessors.

It was a moment which was filled with the powers of eternity in a most mysterious manner. Here, in the oath of Christ, the Everlasting swore by Himself (Isa. xlv. 23).

But it was a tragical moment, as never any other was. For this word—I am He, the Messiah—the people of Israel had waited for centuries as for the watchword of their redemption. The Jews had for years sought to elicit this word from the Lord; and at first, perhaps, with the desire to worship Him, if only He would be a Messiah after their sense; and now, when He declares it, it is to them a savour of death unto death. They charge it upon Him as a crime worthy of death.

[1] The manner of expression, Thou sayest it, is also common among the Rabbis.—Friedlieb, 91.

Jesus sees that His judges had expected, in the obduracy of unbelief, the statement that He was the Messiah. He feels how little they are now capable of recognising in His poor and suffering condition His spiritual and essential glory. Therefore He announces to them how He will authenticate Himself to them, must authenticate Himself by the judicial revelation of His glory. 'Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.'[1]

In this address the high priest perceived nothing of the rolling thunder. He had expected such a declaration. He had, doubtless, previously considered the ceremony which now accompanied the exclamation, Blasphemy! He rent his clothes, with the words, 'He hath blasphemed God!'[2]

'What need we now any further witnesses?' he adds, with a word which acknowledges how terribly the self-destructiveness of the testimonies of the bribed false witnesses had brought him and his companions into perplexity. It was a deeply recovering

[1] Dan. vii. 13, 14. From these words of Christ, it does not follow, as Strauss thinks (ii. 469), that He foretells His speedy parousia, and indeed precisely as second advent (in the chronological sense of the critics). For the coming in the clouds of heaven is evidently to be understood, first of all, of the spiritual reign of Christ in His glory (comp. Neander, 456), certainly so far as this reign brings about precedently the visible second advent of Christ (*vide* Ebrard, 423).

[2] It was a Jewish ordinance, that the clothes should be rent on the hearing of a blasphemy; and herein it was specially ordered that the high priest should rend his clothes from below upward, whereas ordinarily the rent was made from above downward. This rent was not to be sewn up again, Sepp, iii. 473. Upon the ceremony of the rending of the clothes, see Friedlieb, 92. The high priest certainly was not to rend his sacred garments; but he wore them only on high festivals in the temple, 92. [The passages forbidding the high priests to rend their garments are Lev. x. 6 and xxi. 10. Bynæus tells us (ii. 311) that the Jewish doctors understand this to refer only to the sacred robe used in the temple-service. He adds, that it may refer only to the rending of garments as a sign of *mourning*, which the connection of the passage seems indeed to indicate. He also tells us the rent was to be in front, from the bottom to the top. Ellicott, however (p. 337, note), says, 'the rent was to be from the neck downwards.' This Bynæus gives as the rule for ordinary persons. Lightfoot, on Matt. xxvi. 65, quotes from the tract Sanhedrim: 'They that judge a blasphemer first ask the witness, and bid him speak out plainly what he hath heard; and when he speaks it, the judges, standing on their feet, rend their garments, and do not sew them up again.' —Ed.]

sigh of stupid malignity, which here betrayed its whole device, its whole work. But at the same time there was a craft in the word. Caiaphas called the attention of his colleagues to the fact, that at this word it was finally time that the accused should be dealt with, as the stock of false witnesses was come to an end; and immediately he abruptly tendered to them the sentence that they were to pass.

'Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye?'

He does not leave their judgment in the least free as to the fact of Jesus having uttered blasphemy, although this is the substantial question. And yet they are to declare their opinion, to deliver their vote. This can have no other meaning than that they are, without further consideration, to declare the sentence of death. Caiaphas, however, well knew that he could thus anticipate his companions. They all agreed in the sentence: 'He is worthy of death!'

In this sentence of death, Israel had in legal form, but in substantially false application of the law, rejected their Messiah. Thus had the people rejected itself, and abolished the theocratic political value of their law.[1]

As soon as the high council had designated the Lord as a heretic, He was at once treated as a heretic by the surrounding servants of the temple. They spat in His face;[2] they smote Him on the head, on the ear and cheek, with their fists.[3] This might happen here, in the presence of the high council; it was even looked upon as the national exercise of the right of zealots against the Lord. This whole confederacy, stirred up by hellish passions, ventures, in the manner of Zion, to avenge the honour of Jehovah upon a blasphemer.

The judgment of death was declared against the Lord. But it could not at once be executed, because its confirmation must

[1] Against late vindications of the proceeding of the Jews against Jesus, the remark is sufficient, that Jesus was only condemned because He declared that He was the Messiah, and indeed, more precisely, the Son of God. *Vide* Hase, 246.

[2] See above, vol. ii. p. 405.

[3] Olshausen has rightly discovered a type of these experiences of the Messiah in the prophets (Isa. l. 6; comp. Micah iv. 14), especially in Isaiah. Strauss, however, thinks (ii. 470) that it is against the connection of the passage to find here a prophecy of the Messiah, because he does not understand the conception of the typical prophecy.

still be applied for at the hands of the Roman governor.[1] And as the morning had not yet dawned, the condemned could not yet be led forthwith to the Roman procurator.[2] Moreover, this was not practicable on other grounds. The Sanhedrim, which had just condemned Jesus, was a college which, by concert and agitation, had been formed from the concourse of vehement opponents of Jesus. Thus there must still be a more legitimate session of the college, called together in a formal manner, which might then, indeed, confirm in form what was already decreed. This morning session, moreover, seemed to be requisite for other reasons. The Sanhedrim might not sit in the night for judgment upon capital crimes. Moreover, the sentences were not to be accepted hastily; nay, sentences of death were not to be pronounced on the same day in which the hearing occurred.[3] With these requisitions probably the enemies of Jesus might be satisfied, seeing that they had determined to hold a formal session of judgment again at break of day. But in addition, the accusation must be brought in another form if they wanted to be certain of carrying their purpose into effect with Pilate. Thus a pause occurred. Jesus was led away out of the council chamber.

According to intimations in Mark and Luke,[4] it is most pro-

[1] See Neander, 457; Joseph. *Antiq.* 20. 9, 1.

[2] According to Roman law, no judicial sentence given before break of day was valid. Sepp, iii. 484.

[3] *Vide* Friedlieb, 95: 'Because the Sanhedrim, to which, in its business with Jesus, haste was everything, had appointed the trial in the night, and then again in the morning, it probably thought that this would satisfy the above requisitions and so evade the law. For, although they did not thus pass judgment of death at the first hearing, it still occurred on one and the same day, because the day was reckoned from evening to evening.'—P. 96. Upon other violations of the legal appointments for judicial procedure, of which the Sanhedrim was guilty, see the same, p. 87; [or Lightfoot on Matt. xxvii. 1, who quotes the Jewish canon: 'They handle capital causes in the daytime, and finish them by day.' Three other irregularities are also dwelt upon in the same place.—ED.]

[4] According to Mark, Peter was in the hall *below*, in opposition to the judgment-hall, which was thus *above*. In Luke, Jesus turned Himself round and looked on Peter when he denied for the third time. He must thus have come again from the judgment-hall *above* into the hall below: [*i.e.*, into the court a few steps lower than the judgment-hall. Robinson says (see Andrews, 424): 'An oriental house is usually built around a quadrangular interior court, into which there is a passage (sometimes arched) through

bable that He was taken through the hall in which the servants were warming themselves to another guard-room,[1] and, indeed, actually at that moment when Peter had just, for the third and last time, denied Him.

Among the fugitive disciples, Peter first of all took heart again, in conjunction with a second disciple, of whom only John knows any closer particulars, and in whom, according to his usual custom of designating himself by a circumlocution, we are to recognise himself. They followed the procession which led Jesus away, although only at some distance. When they came to the palace of the high priest, that other disciple found direct entrance into the front hall, because he was known to the high priest. He appears boldly to make use of an old access to the house, the ground of which is unknown to us.[2] Peter, on the other hand, appears to have been rejected at the door by a female doorkeeper,[3] and his companion seems not to have missed him until he himself had entered the hall. Then he goes back and speaks to the doorkeeper, and immediately he is allowed to bring Peter in.

This intimation is of inestimable value. We could not sup-

the front part of the house, closed next the street by a heavy folding gate, with a smaller wicket for single persons, kept by a porter. In the text, the interior court, often paved and flagged, and open to the sky, is the *αὐλή* (translated "palace," "hall," "court"), where the attendants made a fire; and the passage beneath the front of the house, from the street to this court, is the *προαύλιον* or *πυλών* (both translated "porch").' The place where Jesus stood before the high priest may have been an open room on the ground-floor; so that from the place where He stood, He might look upon Peter.—ED.]

[1] Sepp goes so far as to assert (484), that after the servants had indulged their petulance on Jesus, they had cast Him into the dungeon. But nothing is said of this; rather from the context it seems plain, that Jesus was guarded by the servants of the temple in a kind of prison-room, and that they there spent their time in ill-treating Him. The reading in Mark, *ἔλαβον*, ver. 65, which has been found a difficulty, may thus be explained by this leading away into the prison-chamber or guard-room: *ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον*—They took Him into custody with abuse. Certainly also the other reading, *ἔβαλλον*, attains its true force under the point of view referred to—They drove Him tumultuously forth out of the hall of judgment. Still the reading *ἔλαβον* is the best attested.

[2] According to the tradition, John must have been known in the house of the high priest as a young fisherman, Sepp, 474.

[3] On the female doorkeepers among the ancients, see Sepp, iii. 474.

pose that the other disciple of Jesus had here denied his relation to Him. Certainly he was not prepared in his spirit to enter into the judgment-hall, and there to testify against the false witnesses on behalf of Jesus; but he submitted to the sentence of his Master, seeing that he was not yet qualified for anything else, and deliberately took the place of being a sympathizing observant friend of the accused. Neither can we suppose that he would have been spared on account of his connection with the house of the high priest, if it had been generally intended to take proceedings against the disciples of Jesus at the same time as against Himself. At the best, this connection only gave him the necessary consideration among the servants of the house, and the power of passing freely in and out so long as they were willing to take no notice of him. If he thus stood with such security on this ground, it is a proof to us that Peter might have entered with equal security under his guidance. That he was purposely overlooked, although it was probably known that he had given the sword-cut to Malchus, is proved by the circumstance, that he had been allowed to escape in Gethsemane just after the event. Probably they were very glad to let him go, because they must have acknowledged the wonderful healing of Malchus by the hand of Jesus, if ever they took proceedings against him on account of what he had done.

We must thus recognise in the difference between the security of the one and of the other disciple, under their circumstances, a very great contrast between their states of mind. The other disciple might also have found special reason to be afraid, for the fact of his being known in that house might just as easily be mischievous to him as afford him protection. But with great inward security he depended upon this precarious acquaintance, and seems therewith to act perfectly freely. Certainly, however, he is not yet a perfect master of the knowledge of the soul, or he would not, under existing circumstances, have led Peter on this slippery ground; but, in any case, he acted in a good faith, which even here refuses to take any advantage over his companions in the following of Jesus. It may, perhaps, be supposed that this disciple depended with peculiar confidence on the word of Jesus, by which He obtains for him and his companions free passage among the enemies. But this very security

with which he enters, gives us a glimpse of the great insecurity with which Peter goes into the hall of the palace. The explanation of this is, perhaps, in the fact, that Peter went in with the consciousness that he had just before drawn the sword against the servants of this house—that he had wounded a servant of the high priest. He can only pass over the threshold of this house with an evil conscience and with great anxiety. Nay, he cannot occupy this position without a sad presentiment, for Jesus has very plainly announced to him that he would deny Him. This great insecurity of his soul cannot fail to impress itself plainly, in so lively a character, and all the more in proportion as he wishes to suppress it. And it was just this effort which appears to have given the first suggestion to his temptation. It was a cold night; the servants had lighted a fire of coals, which was burning in the hall, and were seated around it warming themselves. Peter came into the midst of them to warm himself also. According to Matthew, we must at once suppose that at first he sat himself down, probably to make the expression of his ease and security more perfect. But still his inward disquiet would soon induce him to stand up again. This association of the disciple with the servants attracted the girl who kept the door, who probably found at once that he did not belong to them. She stept forward and asked him, 'Art thou not also one of this man's disciples?' He thus saw himself betrayed in the company of the avengers of the blood of his enemy: trembling and confused, he forgot himself and denied. This first denial, however, seems almost to be willing to deny itself. Very probably Matthew has here transmitted to us the accurate expression of the falling disciple: 'I know not what thou sayest.' In the troubled state of mind in which he now was, he might at first persuade himself that this answer was only a prudent evasion. According to Luke, the maid, with this charge, had sharply fixed her eyes upon him in the firelight; he, on the other hand, repelled her with an anger which made his excitement evident: "Woman, I know Him not.' This was the first denial; it occurred in the hearing of the whole company. Peter had already fallen in the trial of the maid.

It was about the time when Jesus referred Himself in the high priest's trial to His hearers: 'Ask them; they know what I have said.'

According to the two first synoptists, Peter appears immediately after the first denial to have purposed leaving the dangerous place. But, according to John, it might be supposed that he still remained some time at the fire with the servants. Probably he did not want to betray his inward perplexity, but thought to secure his retreat by a little delay. But at the moment when for that purpose he wanted to go back from the hall into the outer hall (in which probably the other disciple had cautiously remained), the second temptation fell in his way. This time the mental disturbance of the distressed disciple was very great. According to Mark, the first cock-crowing was heard without bringing the wavering disciple to recollection. Even in the narratives his excitement has expressed itself. The maid looked on him again, says Mark, and began to say about him to the bystanders, 'This also is one of them.' Another maid looked upon him, says Matthew—the statement which he attributes to her is in meaning the same. Another looked upon him, says Luke, and he said, Thou also art one of them. And according to John several of the servants which stood around the fire asked him, Art thou also one of his disciples? And then, also, the reports of the second answer of Peter are not alike. This apparent complication without constraint assumes a very expressive form. This time it was *the girl who kept the door again—the terrible*, who accused him. But the earlier doorkeeper appears, since Peter's first denial, to have been replaced by another, to whom Peter is quite a new appearance, and who feels herself likewise impelled to denounce and provoke him, and to make him uneasy. Possibly her predecessor had told her of the reserved and yet defiant man. For it was a duty of doorkeepers to keep in view suspicious persons who intruded. One conceives it,—from the disposition of the servants in the high-priestly house, from female fanaticism, or even from female desire to provoke and to practise mere mischief,—that now this one repeats the evil game of the first doorkeeper. She found the special inducement to do so in the fact that the stranger was just purposing to leave the company of the servants. He approached the door, he seemed to wish to slink out of it. But when he was thus laid hold of for the second time, the position of the disciple seemed to be in the highest degree critical. He denied once more, he confirmed the word with an oath—'I know

not the man.' In the meantime, the maid's word had taken fire in the company of servants. At first one individual called him to account with the assertion, 'Thou also art one of them.' This one also he deceived, once more recollecting himself, and saying, 'Man! I am not.' He attained thus much by the energetic declaration, that the men of that company became uncertain, and only pressed him with the question, 'Art thou not also one of his disciples?' Hereupon he confirmed the previous statement that he was not.

But now Peter found it probably no more desirable to withdraw at once. He must now wait, as it appeared, till the attention of the dangerous men has passed away again from him. Thus, according to Luke, he spent about an hour more among them —a time which in that painful position must have been to him almost an eternity. We know not whether he was silent or spoke during that time. It might almost be supposed that he must have spoken a good deal to divert the company from the notion of his being a disciple of Jesus. At least he said so much, that they came to a decided impression of his Galilean dialect. The observation of this, that he spoke the Galilean dialect, brought one man to the full conviction that he must be a Galilean; consequently, also a disciple of Jesus. For what could a Galilean have to do in the general way, at this hour, in this place? If he had spoken the Jewish dialect, the man might have thought that he belonged to the elements of the mob, which had already assembled, and to which was destined by the high priests so momentous a problem for the next morning. The more, however, Peter had asserted that he was no disciple of Jesus, the more this man became aroused; and he doubtless would vindicate in a lively manner his clever combination, since it had become certain to him that he belonged to the company of Jesus' disciples. Suddenly he confronted him with the assertion that he must positively be a disciple of Jesus, for his speech betrayed him. Even this man also Peter passionately contradicted: 'Man, I know not what thou sayest!' But this accusation aroused the whole company, which only a little while before probably had troubled itself about him; and soon they were standing in numbers around him, to provoke him with the assurance that he was certainly a disciple, for his speech betrayed him. They could not, indeed, found any absolute certainty upon

this indication; but now the peril increased once more to an immense degree when another man in the company recognised him again, and cried out, 'Did not I see thee in the garden with him?' And this man, says John, was a servant of the high priest, a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off. John continues simply, that he denied again; but Matthew and Mark add, with their significant 'and he began,'—And he began to curse and to swear, I know not the man!

At this fatal moment the cock was heard to crow! It was for the second time.

At this same moment Jesus was led past the group which threateningly surrounded the denying disciple. He probably heard the last words of his imprecations. He turned round and looked upon him!

His look declared how deeply the disciple had fallen—how terribly he had wounded His heart—and how it bled, not only by his means, but also for his sake. Moreover, probably the disciple could still see the traces of the ill-treatment which Jesus had undergone; or the excitement of the rabble, which could not fail to have ill-treated the Lord, told him that He was condemned by the high council, and sentenced to death.

And now he came to himself again. How he remembered in the depth of his soul the word of Jesus, Before the cock crow, thou wilt deny Me thrice! and he went out and wept bitterly.[1]

We read no further of his being now any more stayed, hindered, or checked. In the depth of his sorrow he saw no more enemies, he knew no more danger, he feared no more death. He felt that he carried all enemies, all dangers, and even death itself, in his heart; and without consideration of them he passed forth through the group of opponents; and although even the

[1] [Bynæus devotes sixteen pages (ii. 371-86) to an investigation of the meaning of ἐπιβαλών (Mark xiv. 72), which is rendered in the E. V. 'when he thought thereon.' He agrees with the interpretation of Theophylact, who judged it equivalent to 'veiling his head.' The fitness of this meaning to the sense, and its appropriateness as occurring in the narrative of Mark, are strongly in its favour; but no instance has been produced of ἐπιβάλλειν used in this sense without a following accusative, indicating the object that has been drawn over the head. Alford takes it to mean 'the *thinking*, or, as we say, "*casting it over*," going back step by step through the sad history.' —Ed.]

circumstance that now the leading away of Christ was occupying the attention of the whole household of the high-priestly palace had not favoured his departure, still the view of the terrible sorrow in the broken man of rock might have arrested, as a sign of God, the profane disposition of the common crowd, and made a way for the contrite one.

Peter went out. He felt that here there was no help in an ordinary recantation. He knew only one satisfaction which could avert the curse of the guilt, and this had announced itself to him in the look with which Christ looked on him. He knew only one way of appropriating this satisfaction—the way of the deepest humiliation before God. Hence it was that he willingly allowed to fall upon him the shame of being a denier among men, while he declared himself guilty in the judgment of God.

He went out into the night—but not into the night of despair, like Judas. Bitterly weeping, he went to meet the morning twilight. The angel of grace led him on his painful way into the judgment of the spirit, which was to doom his old life, especially his old arrogance, to death; and he was so reconciled to death, that he could go to death with Christ in an entirely different, but a far more wholesome sense, from that which he had contemplated. His repentance must first be completed; he must first obtain the peace of grace and reconciliation from the mouth of Christ before he could offer the satisfaction of his guilt towards men in a great confession, before which the scandal of his terrible guilt disappeared.

It is carefully to be observed that Peter, in the progress of his conversion, stands as the first great and brilliant type of the true course of salvation; while Judas, in his remorse, took the contrary way, and would be the first to afford the human satisfaction to the enemies with whom he had guiltily involved himself—but not in this way coming to Christ. Moreover, we must not overlook the typical significance that is found in the inducement to Peter's fall. It was a little maid who kept the door who caused the denial of the first disciple—of him to whom were committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Girls terrified him; and his fall became more and more deplorable the longer he remained among the servants by the fire of coals. And thus also a church-fellowship may prepare for itself a downfall by false popularity, by slavishly succumbing to servile and fanatical

tendencies among the people, by association with the multitude in their ungodly aims.

The watch to whose keeping the Lord had been entrusted until the morning, entirely participated in the fanatical disposition of their superiors, and appeared by degrees to be changed into a band of assassins. They occupied the time in ill-treating the Lord. The first cruelties had begun while they were yet in the presence of the high council. While they were leading Him away also, they seem to have struck Him; and now that they had brought Him into the guard-room, mockings and blows seem to have alternated one with the other. Thence they soon devised a mischievous game, which combined both mockery and violence. They threw a veil over His face, and striking Him, asked, 'Prophesy unto us, thou Christ! Who is he that smote thee?'

This was the treatment of the long-desired Messiah among the watchmen of Zion. They derided His Messianic dignity, especially His prophetic office. He could not have suffered so fearfully if He had fallen into the hands of cannibals,—at least, they would not have racked His inmost heart with that frightful insensibility with which these men denied and mocked the dignity of their Lord and King. Moreover, according to Luke, they devised many other blasphemies of a similar kind, and a round of wanton tricks, in which they derided everything which ought to be sacred in Him to His people. At those moments, when He in this manner was abandoned to the devilish licence of a savage troop, He might well recall that passage in the Psalms, 'Be not Thou far from me; for trouble is hard at hand, and there is none to help me. Great oxen are come about me; bulls of Bashan surround me. They gape upon me with their mouths, as it were a ramping and a roaring lion' (Ps. xxii.). The prophetic feeling of that theocratic singer, which he expressed in these words, found its fulfilment in these circumstances.

Towards the break of day the formal meeting of the members of the Sanhedrim occurred (Luke xxii. 66).[1] And there

[1] It is plain that this examination which Luke describes is an entirely new one, having its own peculiar character. We arrive at this conclusion also from the observation, Luke xxiii. 51, that Joseph of Arimathea had not given his voice (*συγκατατεθειμένος*) to their counsel and plan. The noc-

assembled there all the priests, and elders, and scribes. Every one of these three classes had special motives of enmity against the Lord beside the common one. The one class it offended, that He exalted obedience above sacrifice; the second, that He made revelation the test of institutions; the third, that He opposed the spirit of the word to the service of the letter.[1] They felt that they had been in a thousand ways attacked in their delusion by Him; and now they believed that the day of vengeance had come for them. Thus they led Him up before their high council.[2] The expression seems to imply that they conducted Him in a large procession out of the palace of the high priest into the regular council-chamber, on the mount of the temple. They had now an interest in making a decidedly formal appearance; on the one hand, that they might prevent contradiction among their own people; on the other hand, that they might obviate opposition from Pilate. The trial which now once more they were preparing for Jesus was intended, as has been already hinted, so to formulate His statement that He was the Messiah, that it might be used as an accusation against Him before Pilate. He had confirmed this assertion by oath in the form of His being Christ the Son of God—a form in which they had charged His assertion upon Him as blasphemy against God. But now it was their anxiety to leave on one side as much as possible the theological import of the expression, and to bring forward, on the other hand, the political significance which the name Christ might assume; or, in other words, to make out of the 'Christ the Son of God,' in the sense of Jesus, a 'Christ

turnal judgment at the house of Caiaphas was composed, indeed, of fanatics voluntarily assembled, and of one mind (Mark xiv. 64); the formal court in the morning, in which even the few friends of Jesus in the Sanhedrim could bear a part, was not unanimous: so far Luke's reference to it leads us to conclude that Joseph of Arimathea took part in this session.

[1] Compare Sepp, iii. 486.

[2] Ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον. It is not to be supposed that they could have led Him openly out of the guard-chamber into the upper hall of the high priest's palace. According to the Talmud, the sentences of death must be pronounced in the Gazith (Friedlieb, p. 97; where, however, this statement is questioned). In any case it seemed necessary to a thoroughly formal session, that the Sanhedrim should assemble on the temple mountain. Thus it usually assembled on the Sabbaths and feast-days in a locality within the lower walls (Tholuck, *John* 385).

the King of the Jews,' in their sense.[1] For only in the form of such a Christ, according to their view, could they charge the Lord before Pilate as a criminal, namely, as a rebel. They could only obtain their end by bringing their Messianic ideal—their hope, the thought and aim of their heart—their own darkened nature in the form of Christ—before Pilate, and effecting His condemnation—effecting it in complete self-blinding and self-contempt. Christ observed at once that in this false purpose they now asked Him once more, 'Art thou the Christ? tell us!' He answered, 'If I tell you, ye will not believe Me; and if I also would ask you (asking by way of instruction), ye would not answer Me, nor let Me go' (if it turned out that ye could not answer Me).

In every case, He says, it is entirely in vain if He tells them that He is Christ. The first case, that they should believe on Him, cannot at all be supposed. The second case would be, that by asking He should prove to them that He was Christ; but then He says they would not answer Him, and so accept His proof. And plainly for this reason, lest they should be compelled to let Him go. Thus He has sharply characterized the desperately evil purpose of their question. And doubtless He now retreats again into the consciousness which alone could maintain Him in this fearfully painful crisis of His deepest humiliation with the words, Henceforth shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.

There is no difficulty in the fact of Jesus making this assertion for the second time. As He had for the first time declared this to the smaller assembly of the Sanhedrim, so it was probable that He would repeat it also before the greater assembly. He must announce to them that His judicial control over them would begin from the moment in which they in their judgment rejected Him. It was His purpose to cut off from them every pretext in respect to the meaning in which He had made Himself known to them as the Messiah. Just as easily is explained the circumstance, that the Sanhedrim would have Him once more to repeat the assertion that He is the Son of God; as in

[1] This formulating, strictly taken, was no introduction of another ground of complaint, as Neander thinks, p. 458; but only the transferring of the same charge 'into another form,' as he says; or, more strictly, a misrepresentation of the same assertion of Christ on another side.

this assembly there might be many members who had taken no part in the previous trial.

Although, however, they did not succeed in obtaining from the Lord Himself a declaration which might be misinterpreted still more easily than the previous one, they nevertheless knew how to manage, when they decided to avail themselves of His statement that He was the Christ first of all in a political sense, before Pilate. Probably their last secret consultation, which occurred immediately before the leading away of Jesus, referred to that. They determined upon the leading Him before the forum of Pilate, and agreed upon the course of proceeding; probably also the measures were discussed by which the Jewish people were to be stirred up.

Their manœuvring began by their now breaking up in a mass, as the morning broke, to transfer the judgment to the Roman procurator (Luke xxiii. 1). They probably calculated that a cause which induced them, the whole respectable community, to appear so early in the morning, on the morning of the feast, in procession before the house of the judge with the accused, must assume in the view of the judge the appearance of an altogether aggravated crime.

NOTES.

1. The peculiar relation between Annas and Caiaphas has been explained in many ways. According to Hug, they must both have been high priests by agreement between themselves, and have interchanged by years or by festivals. The former plan Hug thinks the more probable. Friedlieb also follows him in p. 73. But an *official* change of dignity of this kind would have contradicted the hierarchical assumptions of the Jews, and the Roman arrangement as well. But it is historical that Annas, after his official deposition, still in a political capacity exercised an influence upon the re-appointment to the high priest's chair. His son-in-law Caiaphas followed many of his sons in that office. No wonder that the Jews, in their spirit of opposition against the Roman appointment of the high priest, looked upon him as the peculiarly legitimate high priest.

2. The difficulty arising from the fact, that, according to John, the denial of Peter takes place in the house of Annas, according to the synoptists in the house of Caiaphas, has been

explained by different people in different ways. It is remarkable that it should be thought necessary to start from the hypothesis generally, that those men dwelt in two houses remote from one another, and not from the supposition that Peter was guilty of the three denials in one and the same hall during the trial at the house of Annas and of Caiaphas, and that it should be at once decided to argue from the former hypothesis against the actuality of the evangelical representations. At the bottom of this treatment of the subject lies the unreasonable opinion, that two respectable men must necessarily have two houses remote from one another, even in the case of one of them being a rightful, the other an officiating high priest, and besides of one being the father-in-law of the other. From this fixed idea, for which there is no historical foundation, an argument is gathered against actual historical statements, instead of proceeding upon an actual historical observation, namely, the narrative of the three denials of Peter in one household, near a coal-fire. It is natural that Strauss should find this solution of the difficulty too artificial, as Euthymius found it before (ii. 473). It may also be attempted to find a solution by supposing, with Schleiermacher, Neander, and Olshausen, that the second and third denials of Peter occurred during the leading away of Jesus from Annas to Caiaphas. But this is contradicted by the long period of about an hour which intervened, according to Luke, between the second and third denial. Moreover, according to the course which John represents the trial as taking immediately in the house of Annas, it must have been very soon ended.—For the supposition that Annas and Caiaphas inhabited the same palace, compare also Ebrard, 425.

3. The Galilean dialect was so coarse, and generally so unintelligible to the Jews, that the Galileans were not suffered to read in the Jewish synagogues. The Talmudists relate a number of anecdotes of ludicrous misunderstandings arising from the unintelligibleness of the Galilean manner of speaking. Friedlieb, 84; Sepp, iii. 478.

4. It is true that it was contrary to the Levitical notion of purity to keep fowls in Jerusalem, 'because, as they hunted for their food in the dirt, they scratched up all kinds of unclean creatures, and therewith made the sacrifices and other sacred things unclean.' But 'what did the Roman soldiery in the

citadel of Antonia care for Jewish ordinances? And even of the Jews themselves we read, that once at Jerusalem a cock was stoned by the sentence of the Sanhedrim, because it had picked out the eyes of a little boy and killed him.'—Sepp, iii. 475; [or Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi. 34; who also shows that 'cock-crowing' was commonly used among the Jews as a designation of time.—ED.]

5. Pliny names as the time of the second cock-crow (gallicinium) the time of the fourth watch of the night, that is, the time after three o'clock in the morning. On the regular recurrence of the nightly cock-crowing in the East, comp. Sepp, iii. 477. [Greswell says, 'At the equinox, the last cock-crow would, it may be supposed, be about four in the morning, and consequently the first about two, and the second about three; for experience shows that between two successive cock-crows, as such, the interval is commonly one hour; from which natural effect, too, the division of time itself, as founded upon it, must have been originally taken.'—*Dissert.* iii. 216.—ED.]

6. It is entirely characteristic that John records the first trial, Luke the third, Matthew and Mark the intervening one. The first comprised the rejection by the Jews of Christ in its distinct origin, the hatred of Annas,—the second in its secular conclusion,—the two others in its visible centre.

7. That the evangelic history has only related three denials of Peter, is sufficiently explained by Bengel in his Gnomon: 'Abnegatio ad plures plurium interrogationes, facta uno paroxysmo, pro una numeratur.' And although Paulus and Strauss make out a considerable round of denials (Strauss, ii. 476), they owe this attainment to that modern contention about trifles which has so often lost the meaning of the inward characteristics of the history in question.

8. The denial of Peter has been palliated on several opposite grounds. On the rationalistic apologies, see Hase, 242; a Roman Catholic one see in Sepp, iii. 481.

SECTION VI.

JESUS BROUGHT BEFORE THE JUDGMENT-SEAT OF PILATE. THE END OF JUDAS.

(Matt. xxvii. 1–10; Mark xv. 1; Luke xxiii. 1; John xviii. 28.)

The fanatical train of hypocrites composed of the members of the high council, which wished to give itself the credit of a gigantic theocratic procession of zealots, as it advanced with its sacrifice from the house of the high priest to the residence of Pilate, shows to us the Jewish people in that fatal moment in which it consummates the great treason against its Messiah—in which it goes and, in an act of desperation, perpetrates a self-murder on its own theocratic popular life, and thus lays the foundation for Jerusalem's becoming for long future ages a desolation, a field of blood, a place of burial for wandering strangers.

This proceeding of the world-historical Jews found in the gloomy proceeding of Judas, in the most expressive features of frightful reality, its symbolical manifestation. It is not known what became of him after the hour of the betrayal. But it is plain that he could have found no peace. Immediately the sentence of death is pronounced upon Jesus, he is aware of it: he sees it probably because the procession then begins to form.

And, now he begins to see clearly, he is startled, and begins to repent of what he had done. His remorse is very great; for it induces him immediately to make the greatest sacrifices, by turns: his alliance with the high priests,—the pieces of silver,—his life itself. But it is evident from his first step that his repentance is terribly gloomy,—that an impure element of despair poisons it, and changes it into a sorrow unto death.

His sorrow has been sought to be explained in connection with the view, that by his deed he wished to compel the Lord to manifest Himself as the Messiah. Now, it is said, he saw that his project had failed, and with the failure remorse took possession of him. But in this case he would, in the utterance of his sorrow, have in some way expressed his nobler, better intention, and his repentance would probably have had

another issue. Moreover, on this supposition he would certainly not have assumed the absolute failure of his intention in this moment. The same superstition which would have allowed him to hope that, in the moment of his being taken prisoner, Jesus would decide upon the revelation of His power, would have continued to keep him in suspense even to the moment of the crucifixion itself.[1]

And, moreover, it must perhaps be supposed that something of a feeling of disappointed impure expectation poisoned his repentance. Certainly he had not conceived that the whole reward of his deed of shame was to consist in thirty pieces of silver. After such endeavours as his, he must have counted upon special marks of distinction from the high council. This expectation expresses itself instinctively in his hastening, at the beginning of his repentance, to the high priests. But it was just in this expectation that he was deceived. He must now feel that the rulers of the people have long ago dropped him again, as an instrument become needless. The Judas is already forgotten by them, or, what is still worse, they might already have begun to regard him with contempt. Under this experience his conscience may begin to work. The life of Jesus passes once more before his soul. His last words echo in his ears. And now, at the moment when Jesus is consigned by the high priests to the Romans, it is evident to him, that all the curse and all the shame of this, Israel's great deed of sacrilege, will recoil upon him above all others. And as a compensation for all this degradation and this curse, he has only the thirty pieces of silver in his hand. The most frantic avarice could no longer maintain his apparent peace against the grief of his ambition, and against the fear of his soul—the distress of his conscience. Hence originates the terrible condition which soon drives him comfortless to death.

The great gloom of his sorrow is first of all shown in his fancying that he can repair his fault again by himself. He hastens to the high priests and elders. He goes not to Christ, but to them, in the delusion that they *could*, or that they *would*

[1] [And, as Ellicott very distinctly shows (p. 340, note), the expressions of our Lord Himself concerning Judas (John xvii. 12; Matt. xxvi. 24) militate strongly against the idea that the traitor only wished to force our Lord to declare Himself.—ED.]

advise him. Thus gloomy is the beginning. His acknowledgment, 'I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood,' is a grand testimony to the righteousness of Jesus, in the mouth of a man who would gladly have disburdened his conscience with any kind of appearance of reproach against Him; but it is too little to appear as the measure of a penetrating repentance. Had such a repentance inspired him, he would have borne a more worthy testimony to the honour of Jesus; he would also have counted it a happiness to be able to die by His side, instead of one of the malefactors. That his having recourse to those enemies of Jesus was a new source of error, is shown by the harsh rejection conveyed in the abrupt words thrown to him, which were his portion, 'What is that to us? See thou to that.' Thus thrust forth from the cold hierarchical spirits, who doubtless, a few hours previously, had seemed as if they received him as an angel of light, he hurried forward, and now he sought for peace in the desolate temple. There he threw from him the thirty pieces of silver, probably into one of the boxes for offerings,[1] and retreated back into solitude (*ἀνεχώρησε*).[2] But the offering of the blood-stained gift in the temple could not allay the deadly storm in his soul. He went thence and hanged himself.

As soon as the high priests knew of the donation which Judas had made to the temple, they scrupled to place these pieces of silver in the proper treasury of God. 'It is not allowed,' say they; 'for it is the price of blood.'[3] And then, in their pretended holy zeal, they had another sitting about the

[1] [It is decidedly against this supposition that Judas is said to have cast the money down *ἐν τῷ ναῷ*, in the *holy place*, where only the priests might enter. Meyer sees the violence of his despair in this, that it hurried him into a forbidden place. Were there a dropping of the money into a box intended, not *ῥίψας* but *βάλων* would have been used. Comp. Mark xii. 41–4. Besides, that such an interpretation detracts considerably from the power of the scene.—Ed.]

[2] That Judas, after the offering of the money in the temple, before his suicide, experienced one more interval of solitude, is suggested not only by the expression *ἀνεχώρησε*, but also by the following passage, *καὶ ἀπελθών*, etc. As soon as he had confessed his sin, offered a human satisfaction, then made a donation to the temple, he tries to live as an anchoret (a monk), but all in vain! [So Bynæus, who says (ii. 430) the word is used 'de secessu in locum desertum, atque ab hominum consortio remotum.'—Ed.]

[3] Compare Deut. xxiii. 18.

application of the thirty pieces of silver—about the blood-money which they had given to the traitor—how it might be applied in a religious manner, and yet apart from the sanctuary. This is again so characteristic a feature of refined sanctimonious wickedness, that here also only a want of perception could attribute such a trait to the invention of the Church. They came to the conclusion of buying the potter's field, and of making it into a place of burial for strange pilgrims. Hence, says the Evangelist, that field, well known in Jerusalem, is named the field of blood to this very day. He adds, Then was fulfilled the word which was spoken by the prophet Jeremiah, when he said, They took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

It is first of all remarkable, that this passage, literally, does not appear at all in the prophet Jeremiah. And then, again, that the passage in the prophet Zechariah, xi. 13, to which evidently the quotation of the Evangelist primarily refers, has not been literally quoted. This phenomenon has been sought to be accounted for in many ways.[1] It is probably best to suppose here an entirely free application of the prophetic word by the Evangelist. In the eleventh chapter, the prophet Zechariah depicts the misery of Israel, as it is being destroyed by the wickedness of its shepherds. He himself, the prophet, is speaking in symbolical manner in the name of Jehovah, as the representative of the chief shepherd. He rules in this capacity over shepherds and sheep, with the staff *suffering*, and the staff *gentleness*. But the corruption prevails to that degree that he sees

[1] Olshausen, iv. 201; Friedlieb, 101. [The leading suppositions are, that Ιερεμίου is a wrong reading,—that the prophecy existed in some writing of Jeremiah which is now lost, or was uttered by him but not recorded, or was erased by the Jews from the existing book of his prophecy. Meyer and Alford follow Augustine in supposing that Matthew has here made an error through want of accuracy in memory. Lightfoot's view is peculiar: that Jeremiah stood at the head of the prophets, and that therefore any of them might be quoted under his name, as any book of the Hagiographa may be cited under the title of 'the Psalms.' Calvin's decision is perhaps as much as can be made of the difficulty: 'Quomodo Hieremiæ nomen obrepserit, me nescire, fateor, nec anxie laboro. Certe Hieremiæ nomen errore positum esse pro Zacharia, res ipsa ostendit: quia nihil tale apud Hieremiam legitur, vel etiam quod accedat.' Bynæus has carefully collected all the opinions up to his time (ii. 460-78).—Ed.]

himself compelled to break to pieces the staff *gentleness*, which up to that time he had wielded on behalf of the suffering, nobler sheep, whereby the existing covenant was abolished. Therewith also precisely his service of chief shepherd over the people is at an end; and in order to bring to light the greatness of its ingratitude, he requires that his reward should be weighed out to him. The sheep of the flock, however, think so little of him, that they appoint for him a compensation of thirty pieces of silver—this contemptibly small sum, which signifies a trifling amount,—whereby not only his assiduity, but his life itself is put at a value, since his life was pledged for the sheep. But now, when Jehovah has been thus despised in His chief shepherd, He Himself comes forward as the speaker. Cast it away 'for the potter,'[1] He says—the goodly price that I was prized at of them.

[1] I can only thus explain the determining expression אֶל־הַיּוֹצֵר as it is more closely defined by the circumstance that the pieces of silver were brought into the temple, and according to the rendering of the LXX., *εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον*. In the temple there was probably a reservoir which contained the metal for melting, and close by also a division for worthless material, with the inscription אֶל־הַיּוֹצֵר 'for the potter,' or in other words, 'destined for the potter,' who provided the temple-vessels—to be taken away into the valley of Gehinnom. The LXX. had that arrangement in view; and in order to explain the unintelligible word, chose the comprehensive definition: for the melting-furnace. The conjecture of Hitzig, that instead of יוֹצֵר should be read יוֹצֵר = אוֹצַר treasury—temple-treasury, God's coffer—departs from the obvious and appropriate meaning, and instead, adopts one which contradicts the connection. For it cannot be the purpose of Jehovah to lay up these pieces of silver as a treasure in His treasure-coffer. On the grammatical difficulties of this interpretation, see Hengstenberg (*Christology* iv. 40). But if the word is referred directly to the potter in the valley of Gehinnom—so that the expression would convey the meaning of 'to an unclean place' ('to the dogs,' or 'to the hangman,' according to Hengstenberg), it gives, it is true, a very suitable thought, but the thought is still not appropriately suggested: but especially this is true of the circumstance that the prophet was first of all to place the money in the temple. Hengstenberg indeed gives a more exact explanation of the latter destination. Because the temple was the place where the people appeared before the presence of the Lord, there must the people be reproached with their shameful ingratitude, by the giving back of the contemptible piece. From thence it must be conveyed to the potter. The LXX. induces us to abide by the above explanation. It is acknowledged that in the temple the several boxes for offerings had all their special destinations. One thing might still be asked, Ought not the potters of the temple also to have charge of the business of melting down and remoulding for themselves?

And, says the prophet, I took the thirty pieces of silver, and threw them into the house of the Lord 'for the potter.'

It is now probably evident that the prophet is here depicting the Old Testament theocracy in its universalism, consequently in its typical features, as they are fulfilled in Messianism—that he here depicts it to its close, even to the abrogation of the ancient covenant with Israel, expressed by the final breaking of the staff 'gentleness.' Hence the prophet represents Jehovah as He is valued in His Messiah by the people at the close of that covenant, after all His care. Even the circumstance that the thirty pieces of silver are indicated as bad or polluted coin, which was to be thrown away, or in any case to be melted down, is deeply significant.

Thus that passage in Zechariah, penetrated with typical elements, could not be overlooked by the Evangelist. Especially the fundamental thoughts which distinguished it were entirely prophetic. There and here Jehovah had been valued at thirty pieces of silver: *there*, in the work of His prophet; *here*, in the life of the Messiah. There and here this price had been destined to be treated with rejection, to be exchanged. And yet the Evangelist found the literal application of the passage difficult, on account of formal dissimilarities between the typical and the real transaction. He intimates an unlikeness: what was ordered to the prophet to do *there*, Judas and the high priests in common perform here, in that the former brings the money into the temple, the latter lay it out in the valley of Gehinnom. Moreover, in that place of the prophet, the circumstance, that instead of the money a potter's field was bought, was not expressed. But this circumstance was typically foreshadowed in substance with great clearness by the prophet Jeremiah, namely, in chap. xxxii. There the prophet is commissioned by the Lord, at a time when the hope of the people appears to be gone, when the Babylonish captivity is impending, actually to buy a field at Anathoth, which his relative offers to him for purchase. He was thereby to put forward a symbolical sign that there still exist the promise of God and the hope of the prophets for the restoration of the land and of the people. The prophet amplifies this comforting thought throughout the whole chapter. He describes how the land is profaned, especially by the service of Moloch, in the valley Ben-Hinnom (ver. 35)—how it must therefore be-

come a desert. Nevertheless, he says, the land should again be dwelt in. In this land, given up to desolation, shall still be bought fields for money (ver. 43), in the land of Benjamin and around Jerusalem, and thus round about through the land.

This then is probably the living and great word of Jeremiah,[1] which the Evangelist quotes according to the meaning, whilst he more closely defines it by the representations of the prophet Zechariah. Jeremiah bought a despised, neglected place in the land, for a sign that others also would come and buy such abandoned places. And thus, after all, these came and bought the most abominable spot in the land, the potter's field in the valley of Gehinnom,—bought it in the hope that in future times many pilgrims would continue to come to Jerusalem, and actually bought it for the price which had been paid for the Lord Himself. They knew not what they did, the Evangelist seems to say; but unconsciously they established a great and hopeful sign for the future, in a similar manner to that in which Caiaphas unconsciously was constrained to utter the great doctrine of the atonement in that sentence, It is better that one man should die, than that the whole nation should perish.

The citation of Matthew in this place very much reminds one of that quotation, The prophets said that He should be called a Nazarene.[2]

The Apostle Peter also, according to Luke (Acts i. 17), spoke of the end of Judas, in that passage wherein, after the ascension, he refers to the vacancy which had arisen in the company of disciples by the falling away of Judas. 'He was numbered with us,' he says, 'and had obtained the lot of this ministry. Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called, in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood.' Previously the apostle said, that what the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas, must needs have been fulfilled; and now he cites the psalms referred to: 'His habitation must become desolate, and let no man dwell

[1] Olshausen, indeed, thinks that the reference of the quotation to Jer. xxxii. 6 deserves no consideration.

[2] See above, vol. i. p. 404.

therein,' is freely declared in the first one (Ps. lxix. 25): 'His bishoprick let another take,' runs the second (Ps. cix. 8). The first passage expresses the positive curse which befalls the enemies of the true servant of God, who can say of himself, 'The zeal of Thine house hath consumed me, and the reproaches of them that reproached Thee fall upon me.' The second is associated with the very terrible words of the curse which is pronounced upon those who returned to the singer, consecrated to God, his love with hatred. Both the psalms express in powerful forms of feeling the presentiment of that experience which the Messiah must undergo on the part of His worst enemy, and are also certainly psalms which have found their fulfilment in the life of Jesus.

It has often been found difficult to harmonize[1] the differences between the account of Matthew and that of Peter (according to the statement of Luke), especially in the two critical points of the narrative. According to Matthew, for instance, Judas met his death by hanging himself; according to Peter, by a fall. According to the former, the high priests bought the potter's field; according to Peter, one might think that he himself purchased for himself that piece of ground with the pieces of silver.[2] But even if we had to do with the narrative of Peter alone, we should still be compelled to ask, whether it is actually the meaning of that narrative that Judas bought that piece of ground with his money. What is intended here by this dry notice, in a place which expresses the highest contrast with rhetorical vivacity? This Judas, the apostle desires to say, had with the others obtained the glorious lot of carrying on with them the apostolic service—was, just as they were, appointed to the inheritance of the whole world; and now that corner of a field in the valley of Gehinnom is given to him as the reward of unrighteousness. And how is it fallen to his lot? First of all, by his terrible death-fall the plot of ground became his own by his being precipitated on to its soil, bursting asunder, and, so to speak, dissolving into the dreadful inheritance. Thus, first of all, the plot of ground received the name of the

[1] On the several attempts at harmonizing, see Strauss, ii. 481.

[2] In connection with this is the different motive for the naming of the field—the field of blood—as given in Matthew and in Peter. See what follows.

field of blood among the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who were aware of the circumstance of his suicide; although the more informed knew also that the field might be named, on altogether a different ground, the field of blood—namely, on account of the blood-money for which it was acquired. In this manner the apostle has at the same time hinted at the inducement which might lead the high council to buy the field for the thirty pieces of silver. The first consideration which led to this was the burial of Judas. The place which by the suicide of Judas had lately become infamous, might easily be attainable at a cheap rate, and it was an obvious thing to bury the shattered body quickly in the same spot where his bowels were scattered. The high council had, moreover, its special reasons for getting rid of the remembrance of Judas as soon as possible. But since the wretched man had once destined his money for a pious purpose, the high council clung to the notion of making a charitable application of it. And it was entirely worthy of the inventive genius of the pharisaic spirit, that they appropriated the piece of field in which Judas lay buried for a burial-place for the strangers who should die in Jerusalem.

As to the manner of the disciple's death itself, Casaubon has already discovered the harmony: that, according to Matthew, Judas hanged himself over an abyss, the rope gave way, or the branch to which he hung broke, and thus, according to the account of Peter, he fell down headlong and was burst asunder. Against this lively representation it has been objected, that it is entirely inexplicable why Matthew should in this case only relate one half of the proceeding, and Peter only the other.[1] This question is answered, however, from the different points of view of the two men. Matthew wished to depict the despair of Judas in his death, but the last critical act of that was, that he hanged himself. What was beyond that, the Evangelist neglects, because he had to represent there the characteristic conduct of the Sanhedrim with respect to their Old Testament types. Peter, on the other hand, was concerned beforehand with the lot of Judas—with his office and inheritance vacated, which he had forsaken that *he might go to his own place* (acquired by him and suitable to him), (ver. 25). Thus he looks at his end in the special purpose and result, in the moment when, shattered in death, he was spread

[1] Strauss, ii. 483.

out on the field of blood, and thus in the special meaning perished in his inheritance. The manner in which the obtaining by purchase of the field for the thirty pieces of silver occurred, Peter could not describe, since it was in his mind to represent, in a painfully rhetorical antithesis, the ironical working of the curse, that instead of the curse-laden money, the disciple should only receive an inheritance equally accursed.

The time which elapsed from the beginning of the despair of Judas to his end is not specified, but probably the single incidents unfolded themselves towards his death in rapid succession. Its beginning, however, leads us back to the death-journey of his people—the procession of the Sanhedrim.

From the sixth year after the birth of Christ, Judea, with the deposition of Archelaus, had lost its independence, and, together with Samaria, had been annexed by Cæsar Augustus to the Roman province of Syria. Judea was thus under the Roman proprætor, or præses of Syria, but was governed by a special procurator, who was, indeed, subordinate to the proprætor, but generally occupied the place of the governor, commanded the troops of his district, exercised justice, and managed the administration. This procurator usually resided in Cæsarea by the sea; but he came often to Jerusalem, especially at the time of the festivals, and, indeed, accompanied by a body of troops. It was natural that at a time when the entire power of the people of Israel was gathered together, and dangerous disturbances might so easily arise, the Roman power should be induced to present themselves in their highest dignity in this place to the people subdued and striving against their bondage. Besides this political necessity, however, the governors had also an individual interest in being present at the great festival-times of this remarkable people, especially at the Passover. At this time were assembled here the Jewish great men (as, for instance, at this time, Herod Antipas is represented as present from Galilee); hither came many dignified strangers, partly from curiosity, partly from religious creed; and, under these circumstances, a showy worldly life must needs have been developed.

Moreover, it was characteristic of Pilate to wish to be there, for both aspects of the festival excited and attracted him with equal force. He liked to let the Jews feel his power—to treat them with the most imperious insolence, to practise acts of vio-

lence and oppression, for which especially there was abundant opportunity at such festivals.[1] Moreover, it was in accordance with the frivolous worldliness of the weak-charactered, inconstant man, that precisely the worldly side of the Passover-feast attracted him strongly. And thus at this time also he might have promised himself considerable enjoyment, without foreboding that this festival was also ordained to sit in judgment upon his character—to present him to posterity as a type of the moral powerlessness of the proud world-spirit as it had been cultivated among the masterful Romans, and to place him in a position in which he laid the more definite foundation for his subsequent tragical end.

The procession arranged by the Sanhedrim went from the session's hall of the high council over the temple mountain in a northerly direction to the palace of the governor, which stood at the northern foot of the mountain. As the house of the high priest was on the northern declivity of the upper city, or of the hill of Zion, and as a high covered way ran along over the valley Tyropæum, which united the temple-mountain with the hill of Zion, Jesus had probably been previously brought in the train of the high council over this high covered way into the council-chamber on the temple-mountain; and, as we may suppose that the Galilean prince, Herod, when he was in Jerusalem, resided in the palace of Herod, which likewise was situated on the northern side of Mount Zion, so Jesus was probably at a subsequent period led backwards and forwards once more over that high covered way from the common hall to the temple-mountain—an ignominious spectacle for the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

NOTES.

1. Strauss takes great pains, in his section on the death of the traitor (ii. 480), to disconnect the end of Judas as well from a relation to the rope as to the fall, in order to leave him to 'retire into obscurity' after his 'departure from the company of Jesus'—'in which obscurity the historical knowledge of his subsequent fate was lost.' He attempts to explain the origin of the several narratives concerning his end from the passages of the Psalms referred to. What wholly different forms, however, from those of the evangelic accounts must have originated in a

[1] Luke xiii. 1.

mythical counterfeit of the evangelical history according to externally conceived passages of the Psalms, he has himself illustrated (p. 490); and how freely, not especially in this case, Matthew has expounded, not perhaps the New Testament history according to the Old Testament, but the Old Testament according to the New Testament history.

2. Pilate caused disturbances by his acts of violence in Judæa and Samaria, was accused to Vetellius, the præses of Syria, suspended, and sent to Rome by him, where he was deposed about the year 36 after Christ. Subsequently he must have made away with himself under the Cæsar Caius Caligula. Many judgments have been passed upon his character. Compare Winer's R. W. B., the article concerning him. Neander, 459.

3. The high priest's palace after the exile was situated at the foot of the Mount Zion (Nehem. iii. 14–21); whilst the Asmonæans established a secular fortress on the northern side of the temple-mountain, named Baris, which Herod the Great restored anew, and named Antonia, in honour of Antonius.—(Joseph. *de bello Jud.*, i. 21, 1.) Sepp, upon these notices, remarks (iii. 465): 'For the rest, we find here declared as on a monument, by the position of the different judicial palaces on Zion on the one side, and on Moriah on the other side, that the spiritual jurisdiction was secularized, and the secular power was established in the place of the spiritual.' Doubtless Pilate now dwelt in the palace which was connected with the fortress Antonia, where the soldiery were stationed at his command. There also was the prætorium, the house of the governor and judge—as the tradition, moreover, has assumed. But the special palace of Herod was situated in the upper city, where Herod built two gorgeous palaces. (See Josephus as above, and v. 4, 4.)

SECTION VII.

JESUS BEFORE THE SECULAR TRIBUNAL. [THE THREEFOLD CHARGE: THAT HE IS A STIRRER UP OF THE PEOPLE—A BLASPHEMER OF GOD—AN ENEMY OF CÆSAR. THE THREE TRIALS: BEFORE PILATE—BEFORE HEROD—AND AGAIN BEFORE PILATE. THE THREE WARNING TOKENS: THE IRRITATION OF THE SANHEDRIM—THE DREAM OF PILATE'S WIFE—THE ASSERTION THAT JESUS WAS THE SON OF GOD. THE THREE ACQUITTALS. THE THREE ATTEMPTS AT DELIVERANCE: BARABBAS—THE SCOURGING—THE FINAL RESISTANCE OF PILATE. THE THREE REJECTIONS OF JESUS BY THE JEWISH PEOPLE. THE THREE CONDEMNATIONS: THE DELIVERY OF JESUS TO THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE—THE SCOURGING—THE DELIVERY TO DEATH. THE SECOND AND THIRD MOCKERY OF CHRIST. THE HANDWASHING OF THE HEATHEN. THE JEWS' IMPRECATION UPON THEMSELVES.] THE CONDEMNATION TO DEATH!

(Matt. xxvii. 11–31; Mark xv. 1–20; Luke xxiii. 1–25; John xviii. 28–xix. 16.)

The high council had hardly been able to wait for the break of day to pronounce the last formal sentence of death against Jesus (Mark xv. 1); they had then put Him in chains anew as a sign of His condemnation (for during the trial he had probably been released from the bonds), and with the pomp of a great procession of accusers He was led to the common hall or prætorium[1] of Pilate. But before the palace the procession halted. Its members could not enter the house of the heathen, for fear of polluting themselves. This was the requisition of the Passover. Whoever polluted himself was forbidden to eat the Passover. The eating of the Passover thus as a rite lasted through

[1] The prætorium (πραιτώριον) is, first of all, the general's pavilion in the Roman camp; then the dwelling of the head of the province (prætor, propraetor), where He administered justice also. See Winer, article Richthaus. The prætorium of Pilate was the old royal palace of Herod. Sepp, iii. 527.

the whole feast-day.[1] Here again, also, there is manifest to us a wide contrast between actual righteousness and the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. While they are making a sin-offering of their Messiah, and surrendering Him to death, they will keep holy the external Passover-feast with the most exact zeal.

Pilate yielded to the popular custom by coming out of the palace to them. But probably the disturbance at so early an hour, as well as the ostentatious form of the procession which awaited him before his door, annoyed him. He was all the more disposed to get rid of the affair quickly, asking without further delay after the substantial matter, 'What accusation bring ye against this man?'

This question presupposes that he has first of all to inquire, and consequently to determine in the character of a judge upon, the guilt or innocence of the accused, whether He is innocent or not. Thus he placed the members of the high council, who had assumed the dignity of judges, in the position of complainants. These, on the other hand, proceeded upon a totally different assumption. They thought that Pilate was antecedently to acknowledge their judicial dignity, as well as their sentence of death, and only formally to confirm the latter. In this sense they said, as if insulted, 'If He were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered Him up unto thee.' They thus implied that they attributed to the Roman State no right to revise their hierarchical capital sentence—that they wanted to make him the executioner of their fanaticism, while they took the credit to themselves of acknowledging the supremacy of his tribunal. But Pilate felt himself offended in his pride of office by the arrogant speech of the priests; he ironically replied, 'Then take ye Him, and judge Him according to your law!' They were thus made to feel that they could only award death to the accused, by substantiating the proceeding against Him before the Roman forum, which should condemn Him in the legal form; but if they wished their priestly law to decide against Jesus, they must needs be satisfied with inflicting the priestly punishment upon Him—the punishment of excommunication. The

[1] Vol. i. p. 203. It is remarkable that, according to the Jewish tradition, the members of the Sanhedrim were bound to spend the day fasting on which they had condemned a man to death.

answer of Pilate was thus, in a juridical sense, perfectly appropriate. It compelled the Jews to speak out plainly what they wanted; and they did so in the words, 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.' The Evangelist adds, 'that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which He spake, signifying what death He should die.' Had the Jews dared to put Him to death as a presumed blasphemer, according to their law, they would have stoned Him (as subsequently they actually put Stephen to death in riotous violation of the existing ordinance). But in surrendering Him to the Romans for death, they obtained for Him the kind of death with which the Romans were accustomed to punish the greatest crimes—the punishment of the cross.[1] This was exactly what Christ had foreseen and foretold; and as He had thus defined the manner of His death, the word must be fulfilled.

But it was consistent with the most special decrees of the foresight of God, that Christ must die on the cross. The sign of the deepest curse of the world, the cross, was to be changed into the sign of the highest salvation by His death—the salvation of the world. The pain, the disgrace, the slowness, the consciousness, the publicity of this kind of death, made it in the highest sense the peculiar death it was. The death on the cross was the prince of deaths, and no sign could be so lively as that of the cross. The tree of excommunication, or the cursed branch of the Israelites,—the sign of abhorrence and contempt for the Romans, the notorious stake of ignominy,—this sign could be actually, as the crown of all curse and as the symbol of all judgment, converted, through the grace of God, into the extreme opposite: might be changed from the cursed tree into the tree

[1] Crucifixion was not only customary among the Romans '(according to Cicero, since the time of Tarquin), but also among the Persians, Africans and Egyptians, Greeks, and especially the Achæans,' but it was only used for the lowest criminals, and especially slaves. Among the Hebrews also, there was practised the hanging of an outlawed person on the tree (Deut. xxi. 22, 23; Joseph. viii. 29, ch. x. 26; 2 Sam. xxi. 9). But in this case the putting to death generally preceded the suspension; and this was done to those who were condemned, for blasphemy or for idolatry, by stoning. Sepp, iii. 532. In substance, the public exposure on the tree was, among the Hebrews, an original token of cursing and destruction; thence the symbol of the brazen serpent, and the references of Jesus, John iii. 14, xii. 32.

of life; from the disgraceful beam of the outstretched arms of malefactors, into the uplifted standard of the outspread arms of the Deliverer; from the cross into the star of salvation. And thus this instrument of death stands in its significance before the spirit of the Christian Church, and Christ Himself has in many ways referred to the significance of this mode of death.

The last word of the Jews comprised the decided assurance that Christ had committed a crime for which the punishment of death was due to Him. They now complied (as appears from what follows) with the demand of Pilate, and declared the charge on which the Roman had to found his proceeding. They asserted that Jesus made Himself King of the Jews. Nay, they ventured moreover to declare that He forbade the payment of duties to Cæsar, although they had known the exact opposite. We have seen how, with perfidious consciousness, they could distort His statement, that He was the Messiah, into a statement of this kind. So now, as on their side they reconciled themselves to the claim of Pilate, he on his part was also constrained to go into their complaint. It addressed itself to the charges of conspiracy, sedition, and high treason.

Pilate now set about the judicial examination of Jesus.[1] He withdrew into the interior of the prætorium, and had Jesus summoned thither. We observe in the sequel, that the Roman judge alternately occupies a threefold position. When he speaks with the Jews about the proceedings, he is standing without on the square in front of the palace among them. When he undertakes the judicial hearing, he withdraws with the accused and with the witnesses, who take part in the proceeding, into the judgment hall, carefully, no doubt, attended by some representatives of the complainants.[2] But when he declares the judicial sentence, he mounts the judgment-seat, which is erected on a

[1] Upon the Roman mode of procedure, see Friedlieb, 105.

[2] See Luke, ver. 14; ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας. Pilate could not have withdrawn into the prætorium with the accused in order to hear Him in secret, for Roman judgments must be held publicly (Friedlieb, 104). He withdrew, it is probable, that the trial might be proceeded with undisturbed. Therein the complainants were represented by individuals who determined to renounce the keeping of the Passover, with the purpose of celebrating the smaller Passover subsequently. Such a participation in the trial, moreover, according to the principle of publicity, was free also to the dependants of Jesus; and among them some might determine to be present

consecrated foundation on the elevated stone platform.[1] Thus is plainly evident the powerlessness of the weak wretched judge, who wants to accomplish, and cannot accomplish, the judgment upon the actual Judge of the world, against the great judgment of the world,—that he goes backwards and forwards into three positions, ever returning again to the trial, ever again mounting the judgment-seat (Matt. ver. 19; comp. John xviii. 13) to pass the judicial sentence.

He began his trial with the question to Jesus, 'Art Thou the King of the Jews?' Jesus recognised at once the difficult and perilous double sense of this question, which the Roman judge did not perceive; and it was likewise plain to Him how the malice of His adversaries intended in this matter to deceive Pilate. He could not possibly therefore answer directly to this question. If without more words He said, Yes, He acquiesced in the meaning in which the Roman asked Him—He acquiesced in the charge of sedition which was brought against Him. If He said unconditionally, No, then, according to the deepest consciousness of His accusers, He disowned the hope of Israel, His Messianic dignity, the whole importance of His personality. Hence the counter-question to the judge, which was to elicit the meaning of the question, 'Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of Me?' In other words, Is the expression of the charge thy expression in thine own meaning, or the expression

at the trial, at the cost of the keeping the Passover, more easily than most of the Jews. Thus the question of Strauss is answered, Whence had the Evangelists knowledge of the trial going on in the inside of the prætorium?

[1] The judge must pronounce the judgment from a dignified position—from the judgment-seat. The Roman judges placed this on a conspicuous stone platform (Lithostroton), which might be adorned in various ways with beautiful mosaic work. Such stone platforms were taken by Roman generals even in war along with them. But it was natural that before the prætorian palace especially a high pavement of such a kind should be erected (Gabbatha). Winer has, however, reasonably doubted (Art. Lithostroton) whether the Lithostroton mentioned by Josephus, *de bello ud.* 6, 1, 8, is here meant. [Bynæus (iii. 167) gives the definition of Lithostroton from Pliny, a pavement, 'parvulis certe crustis,' *i.e.*, as above, a mosaic pavement. He also quotes from Suetonius' Life of Julius Cæsar, that he 'in expeditionibus tessellata et sectilia pavimenta circumtulisse.' In the same place it is very distinctly made out that Gabbatha, while a name of the same place, signified the slight eminence on which the tribunal was raised, 'quo magis conspicua sedes foret.'—ED.]

of My accusers? Thus is implied that in the latter case the expression is a captious and entangling one. Pilate likewise begins now to notice, that in the mouth of the Jews the word has a different meaning from what it has in his own.

He feels the weight of the distinction of Jesus, and on his side makes it prominent with Roman pride. 'Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered Thee unto me. What hast Thou done?' The dim consciousness that he may have been duped by the complainants by an enigmatical expression in respect of the accused, appears to put him out of humour. Peevishly he repels the notion of his having himself so formulated the expression of the complaint, or of his being willing to receive it in the Jewish sense. This distinction places him, in respect of honesty, far above his rivals. Their Jewish pride has not withheld them from perfidiously confounding in their complaint the Roman and the Jewish view with one another. Pilate, on the other hand, in his Roman pride, will have them sharply distinguished. There is a theocratic and world-historical significance in the saying of the heathen,—of the representative of the heathen world to the Messiah, Thy people and the high priests have delivered Thee to me. But now, that no fallacy of misunderstanding may slip in, Pilate asks directly, in the spirit of the Roman world, 'What hast Thou *done?*' (What is Thy actual crime?) To this Jesus could not immediately answer that He had done nothing, without giving to the matter an entirely wrong turn. The Roman is to know that Jesus is not only innocent in the sense of Roman justice, but also that He is a King in the sense of the Israelitish religion. He must know that there is a totally different world from the world of Roman doing, namely, the kingdom of truth, and that Jesus is King in this kingdom. Finally, he must know that the accused has fallen into his hands, not in consequence of complications of private justice, but in consequence of a decisive war; namely, in a dispute of two kingdoms,—of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world,—in which he indeed externally is subdued, but in order that He may spiritually conquer. In this sense Jesus answers him, 'My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.' In that case, He says, the power of His kingdom would probably know how against

the weak Jews to maintain Him, whereas the proud worldly might of the Romans could not maintain Him. 'But now,' He adds, 'is My kingdom not from hence.'

In these words we find the world-historical encounters between the Spirit of Christ and the genius of the Roman world, just as, in the same significant opposition, a short time before, the first meeting of Christ with the Grecian world spirit occurred in the limits of the temple.[1]

The words, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of Me? were in this more general symbolical meaning highly characteristic. It was the spiritual weakness of the Roman, with all his energy, that in religion, as well as in philosophy and poetry, he was in many ways not *original*, but appropriated to himself alien and foreign modes of thought and expression.[2] Thus as, on the one side, he often consented to obscure his own special point of view, so, on the other, in the pride of his limited energy, he was deficient in that he would recognise no real world except the world of action, wherein he reigned with such power. Thus Pilate must learn from the mouth of Jesus that there is another kingdom besides the kingdom of this world, and that this kingdom is more mighty than the kingdom of the world in all its earthly fulness of power, even although it should be granted that its king is treated as an evil-doer; yea, that this kingdom triumphs in the way of suffering, and must, as the kingdom of a new world, take the place of the old kingdom of this world. This perception was wanting to the Roman spirit,—that the highest power of the greatest kingdom proceeds from the deepest suffering, just as the perception was wanting to the Grecian spirit, that the purest glory of beauty must proceed from the spirit of self-renunciation, from the grave, from death, and apparent annihilation. And how hard it is even now for those two great world-spirits to grasp these truths!

The mysterious word of Jesus arrested Pilate's attention. 'Art Thou a King then?'[3] he asked; Jesus answered, 'Thou

[1] John xii. 14. Comp. above, p. 56.

[2] [So that the state policy of Rome has received for its motto these words from Tacit. *Annal.* xi. 24: 'Transferendo huc quod usquam egregium fuerit.'—ED.]

[3] Rauschenbusch (*Leben Jesu*, 401) observes: 'Pilate remembered that

sayest it! Yea, a King I am.' The Synoptists have made this chief assertion prominent, that He is the King of the Jews, as the acknowledgment of Christ,—namely, in the deeper meaning of the scripture,—neglecting the qualification of them.

Pilate, the proud representative of the Roman Cæsar, could not but appreciate this moment, in which Christ enunciated His perfect kingly consciousness before him; and there was a deep but brief pause!

Then Christ, explaining and meeting the mistrust of the Roman, which would be likely to show itself, adds the words: 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth!' Every king is, according to His idea, a born and called witness—that is to say, the first world-historical witness and maintainer—of the idea of his kingdom. Thus Christ is the witness and maintainer of the truth, which is the highest kingdom; and therefore Christ is the King of the highest kingdom. But He is this King thoroughly, entirely,—altogether born for it, and altogether chosen or sent for that purpose. Thus he was a King in the complete power of right of birth and right of choice.

When Christ had thus declared Himself to Pilate as the prince in the kingdom of truth, He adds a word which is addressed to Pilate's conscience: 'Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice!' Whoever is accustomed to surrender himself to the attraction of eternal truth, must perceive the spiritual and real royal power and authority of this attraction in the word of Christ. The citizens of the kingdom of truth feel the power of their King when they perceive His voice and adore Him.

This was a moment when a spirit that felt its need of truth would have hearkened and questioned; Pilate, on the contrary, appeared to begin to find the debate troublesome. With the often-quoted expression, 'What is truth?' he hastened forth out of the hall, to give to the Jews without, the statement, 'I find no fault in Him!' That contemptuous expression has rightly

formerly, in Rome, many sacrifices could only be offered by kings, and that thus, in the times of the Republic, for these sacrifices a 'sacrificial king,' as he was called, was chosen, for it was the name of a 'king' that was wanted. Just so, even to the times of Pilate, some families had the undisputed surname of 'king' (Sueton., *Life of Cæsar*, 6th ch.). Pilate must, indeed, first try whether he is to give the title of king to Jesus from Jewish traditions.

been considered as a proof of his want of the higher perception of truth. If he had sought for truth, he would not have thrown forth the question in displeasure, without caring for the answer; but have impressed it as a true question, yea, as a prayer for the truth, and he would have waited for the answer. It cannot be said, moreover, that he threw out the question as an actual sceptic, who had gone through the systems of philosophy, and had ended by coming to despair of the knowledge of the truth. In this case he would have at least been still anxious to know about the system of Jesus. Doubtless he was infected, in his frivolous worldliness, with the sceptical atmosphere of his time; but the soul of his word was plainly the arrogant indifferentism which by anticipation chooses to find all the higher questions of the spiritual life wearisome.[1] But if he is to refer the expression of Christ, that He is the King in the kingdom of truth, in its practical meaning, to the accusation in question,[2] he might probably think that the kingdom of truth is an airy and contemptible fairy-land. Thus, whoever wishes to be king there in a harmless world of devout phantasy, cannot hurt the Roman eagles. But if we regard the two last sayings of Pilate in the relation of theory and practice to one another, we see at first that he himself contradicted his doctrine by his deed; for in the words, I find no fault in Him! he declared a great truth. But we soon see likewise, that such a judicial mode of treatment as depends upon the unsound foundation of despair of the truth will not abide the proof.

The Evangelist Luke tells us in this place (ver. 5 et seq.), that the Jews fiercely resented the declaration of Pilate, that Jesus is without fault, that He is no seditious person; and that they asserted, on the contrary, that He in any case stirs up the people by going round through the whole of Judæa teaching. But when they could not help seeing that Pilate was also convinced of the innocence of Jesus, on the ground that in the range of his administration Pilate had never known anything of Him contrary to the law, they declared with emphasis that Jesus had at first begun His ministry in Galilee, and proceeding first from thence on His expedition, had finally come also to

[1] Sepp assures his readers that this is actually the stand-point of modern Protestantism.

[2] Ebrard, 428.

Jerusalem. Doubtless they wished to suggest the thought to the judge, that Jesus had not yet been long enough in Judæa for Him to be charged with much in the way of sedition (except His festal entry, to which they might refer); that in Galilee, on the other hand, He had excited the people for a much longer time; and many histories of Him were known there. But Pilate did not allow himself to be thus ensnared. As the proceeding had for some time begun to be uncomfortable to him, he eagerly caught at the intimation that Jesus had at first appeared in Galilee,—he asked whether He was a Galilean; and at once availed himself of the information, that Jesus was by birth a subject of Herod Antipas, to direct Him to that prince, who was keeping the Passover in Judæa.[1]

The Galilean prince was conceited and frivolous enough to notice nothing of the necessity and difficulty which this prisoner caused to his judges. He rejoiced exceedingly when Jesus was referred to him in this manner. He rejoiced, because he had long wished to see Him, without having his wish satisfied. The origin of this wish was his having heard so much of His miracles, which he regarded probably altogether as specimens of a supernatural magical power, and because he would fain have seen the like performed by Him. Thus he had now no other wish than that He would only thus perform a miracle, as Herod conceived it.

With this view, he appears to have asked Him question after question with many words. Perhaps He might prophesy to him; perhaps give intelligence about John the Baptist: we know not. But it is plain from the connection, that Herod was very far from thinking of taking proceeding against Him with judicial dignity; still less, however, of regarding Him as a prophet of God. Jesus might amuse or interest him, as a mighty magician, or perhaps might announce good fortune to His egoistic superstition. Anything else he sought not from Him. It is a terrible sign to see how this prince had carica-

[1] He referred Him from the 'forum apprehensionis ad forum originis vel domicilii.' Friedlieb, 107. 'This policy was not strange in the Romish kingdom.'—Comp. Dionys. Hal., L. iv. c. 22. In a similar way, also (Acts xxvi. 3), Festus seized a favourable opportunity not to disoblige the exasperated Jews who panted for the blood of Paul.—Comp. Sepp. 495. On the later palace of the elder Herod, in which probably the Galilean prince Herod resided during his sojourn in Jerusalem, compare Sepp, 496.

tured to himself his representation of this *first* among his subjects, although Jesus had excited his whole territory by His Spirit. And thus indifferently he would regard Him, notwithstanding that the Baptist had lived in his neighbourhood, and had made some impression upon him by the spirit of the prophets. It was, however, wholly characteristic of the Spirit of Jesus, that He answered no word to all the questions suggested by the fawning excitement and folly of the frivolous man.[1] Not only was not Herod His judge, but he did not conduct himself as His judge.

It has been observed with reason, that in this painful position Jesus expiated the sins of all those who profane their talents for the sinful entertainment of the great.[2] But He just as much expiated the excessive vanities which thus in a thousand ways obscure the courtly life, especially the sins of the Herodians.[3] But whilst He thus by His silence held the mirror up to His former ruler, in which he might recognise his own unworthiness, the priests and scribes stood by and accused Him severely. But notwithstanding that Herod felt himself greatly annoyed by the silence of Jesus, he did not venture to condemn Him to death.[4] He must have known too well, that there had been nothing to charge against Jesus in Galilee which deserved punishment; moreover, He had probably heard that Pilate had found no guilt in Him. Besides, the remembrance of the execution of the Baptist might still make him somewhat fearful in the matter of the murder of prophets. But, on the other hand, he ventured just as little to set Jesus at liberty. He was probably prevented from this, not only by ill temper and annoyance with Him, but also by consideration of the feeling of the people; but especially by the wish to return the compliment of the Roman noble, which consisted in transferring the prisoner to him, by sending Him back before his court. But he could not dismiss the Lord without insult: as he formerly had yielded the life of the Baptist as a prize to his courtiers and

[1] Thus there is no question of a 'guilty answer,' as Strauss wishes here (ii. 498).

[2] See Rauschenbusch, *Leben Jesu*, 405. [3] Sepp, iii. 496.

[4] The supposition of Olshausen, that it appears on this trial that Jesus was not born in Nazareth, but in Bethlehem—and so not under the jurisdiction of Herod—and that this influenced the trial, is really trifling.—Strauss, ii. 498.

officers, so he did now with the dignity of Jesus. He and his company began to treat the Lord contemptuously, to make a mock of Him, and finished by sending Him back to the Roman in a brilliant white robe: that was the second mockery of Jesus.

By the white robe, the vain prince gave to Pilate something to think of. This robe might indicate the innocence of Jesus; but it might also characterize Him as a visionary, who wished to be regarded as a victorious King: it might finally designate Him as the claimant—the *candidate*, in the Roman meaning—who wished to obtain for Himself, among the Romans, a King's crown, as the King of the Jews.[1] The last meaning was probably the thought of Herod—a thought in which, so to speak, the dream of his own soul betrayed itself; for his soul was already far on the road to Rome, to ask for himself there, in the character of a claimant, the royal crown.

Pilate had sent Jesus to Herod specially for two reasons. The one was, that he wished to rid himself of the proceedings. This intention was frustrated by the politeness and foolish frivolity of Herod. All the more plainly Pilate saw the other accomplished. He had wished to conciliate the tetrarch, with whom till then he had lived in disagreement.[2] There is a fearful emphasis in the expression of Luke: The same day, Pilate and Herod were made friends together.[3] It was the day of the

[1] Friedlieb, 109. [Ellicott (344, note) says that it seems 'very doubtful' whether this was the white robe of the 'candidatus,' and prefers to consider it a gorgeous robe, designed to express Herod's contempt for the pretensions of this King. What he says, however, upon the word λαμπρός not being applicable to the robe of the candidate, because not necessarily involving the idea of *whiteness*, would equally apply to candidus itself. That λαμπρός may be used to express the glittering whiteness of the candidate's robe, is plain from the fact that in Polybius, x. 15, λαμπρός is the very word chosen for that purpose. Whether it be so used here admits of doubt.—ED.]

[2] We are referred, in this place, to the fact that Pilate had formerly put to the sword in Jerusalem certain Galileans (Luke xiii. 1). But the disunion between a tetrarch of Galilee and a Roman procurator hardly needed this special explanation, particularly if the characters of the two men be taken into account.

[3] Sepp makes the remark here (501): 'Thus the Lord, in His extremest humiliation, was still the means of reconciliation among His enemies.' Could the important saying of the Evangelist be more mischievously misunderstood?

union of all evil men, of all wicked men, of all sinners against the Lord.

In the evil pleasantry wherewith Herod had ended his hearing, Pilate could, indeed, find no decisive judgment. But he probably found a sign therein that he held the accused to be a dangerous man, even as a fanatic; and this confirmed him in his own judgment. To complete this in a formal manner, he now ascended the judicial throne. Here he had the accusers of Jesus formally cited (Luke, ver. 13), the high priests, the elders, and the people; although probably the greater part of them had formed a tumultuous convoy to Jesus, first on His way to Herod, then back again to Pilate, and thus were already on the spot. Pilate waited till the tumult subsided (Matt. ver. 17), till he saw the parties of the accused and accuser again opposed before him. This would take some time, for the members of the Sanhedrim had mingled themselves among the crowds of people in order to stir them up, and to instruct them in case the judge should declare that Jesus should be set free, as they saw to be likely.

Pilate, in the meanwhile, had time to reflect upon the relations of the proceedings. He might for a still longer time have had some intelligence of Jesus, and have known that He had not concerned Himself with political but with religious matters. On the requisition of the high priests, he had placed at their disposal a large body of men to take Jesus prisoner; and it is natural that the officers who were with this company must have soon been convinced in Gethsemane that the summoning of this armed force in this case was something more than a needless pomp—that it argued a personal enmity of the high council against the wonderful man whom even they learnt to fear. And if in this feeling perhaps they made their report to the procurator, the way was sufficiently prepared for him to conclude from the whole passionate conduct of the opponents of Jesus, that they had delivered Him out of envy, that Jesus must have in some way enraged them by the exercise of great spiritual powers. In this thought there was for him the first great warning against the condemnation of Jesus. Thus he awaited the appearance of the accusers, when a special circumstance strengthened him in his purpose to set Jesus at liberty—a message from his wife. She sent to say to him, 'Have thou nothing to do

with that just man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of Him.'

According to the tradition, Pilate's wife was called Claudia Procla, and belonged to the class of devout heathen women who, at the time of Jesus, had become, as proselytes of the gate, friendly to the religious faith of the Jews, and to their religious worship in the synagogue.[1] The dream of Pilate's wife can offer no difficulty to the unprejudiced mind. The supernatural and the merely humanly natural are here entirely at one. If Pilate's wife were a devout woman of noble mind, she must probably have given to the intelligence about Jesus a totally different kind of attention from that of her husband. But now the messages of the high priest had come late on the previous evening to the house of the procurator, and had asked for the troops to be sent against Jesus. Probably the Roman lady did not go to sleep till late, on account of her excited thoughts about this marvellous history. An uneasy morning dream, in which Jesus as an exalted mysterious personality, as the righteous One, formed the centre, in which her husband was involved in the guilt of others against this righteous man, or might become involved in that guilt, awakened or frightened her up. She now learned that Pilate was officially busy already with the proceeding against the Galilean. The near tumult of the people told her how full of importance the case was considered by all; and impelled by pious fear, affectionate solicitude, and anxious presentiment, she sent the warning message to her husband.[2] It is a frequently occurring phenomenon, that noble and religious

[1] Chiefly in the apocryphal gospel of Nicodemus. An ancient Roman law of the State, which Augustus had once more put in force, prohibited Roman statesmen and legates from taking their wives with them into the provinces entrusted to them. They wished to avert the prejudicial paralyzing influences which they might exercise upon the course of world-subduing policy. Evidently a prelude of the Roman Catholic celibate. But under Tiberius those decrees were so far modified, as that the governors were to be held responsible for all the intrigues of their wives. Sepp. iii. 507; Tacit. *Annal.* iii. 33, 34, iv. 20. [The note of Lipsius on the passage cited from Tacitus contains all the information necessary on this point. Bynaeus (iii. 106) quotes in addition from Ulpian: 'Proficisci autem Proconsulem melius quidem est sine uxore. Sed et cum uxore potest: dummodo sciat Senatum, Cotta et Messala consulibus, censuisse futurum, ut si quid uxores deliquerint, ab ipsis ratio et vindicta exigatur.'—ED.]

[2] As formerly Calphurnia warned Cæsar of the fatal day. Sepp, iii. 506.

women walk, like watching guardian angels, by the side of husbands frivolous and entangled in the world, and in the most critical moments check them with warnings. It is, further, an entirely natural phenomenon, based in the idea of contrast in which extremes meet, that just the men of cold, calculating intellect, of unbelief and worldliness, are they who experience in themselves the reaction of the most mysterious signs of the higher world of feeling, whose existence they ignore; that, finally, the voices of innocent children, of foreboding women,—that visions of the night, and dreams, terribly cut across the bold security of their easy world of intelligence or worldly sphere, confined and limited as it is. But that the dream may become the organ of warning, divine voices a medium of God's Spirit, is plain from the nature of the dream-life itself, and the manifold facts of general as well as theocratic history testify thereto. And if ever a night was sufficiently important to suggest such dreams to susceptible souls, it was that night in which Jesus was betrayed. The notorious critic, indeed, who usually, in the theologic region, can know nothing of the theologic conception of a purpose,[1] but has been able to ask in this as in other cases, ever after the purpose of religious visions and voices, forgets himself in this place so much as to seek for the purpose of this warning voice, after the purpose of a significant woman's dream.[2]

Thus prepared, Pilate from the judicial throne delivered before the assembled complainants his sentence: 'Ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people (as a revolutionary demagogue); and, behold, I having examined Him before you, have found no reason in this man for the accusations which ye bring against Him. No, nor yet Herod; for I sent you to him, and lo (this is the result) nothing worthy of death is done unto Him. I will therefore (thus runs the judgment itself) have Him chastised and let Him go!'

The sentence of acquittal was thus not simple and without conditions. The punishment of scourging was to satisfy the hatred and the hostile feeling of the Jews against Jesus. But how could Pilate bring this sentence into harmony with his

[1] Strauss, *Dogmatik*, i. 389.

[2] Strauss, ii. 502. On this exaggeration of a pettifogging mode of arguing, see Ebrard, 431.

judgment, that Jesus was without fault? He might have persuaded himself that He had deserved some little correction for His fanatical influence upon the people, by which He had already caused him so much trouble.[1] But it is more probable that he would have the scourging undertaken in accordance with the right which he had of putting the accused to the torture.[2] It is true that the punishment of torture was not applied when the sentence of acquittal was already pronounced; but as it belonged once to the right of the judge, he might think that he could reserve to himself the supplementary execution of it—all the more if he intended the punishment to convince the accusers still further of the innocence of the accused. And this purpose he actually referred to the scourging, according to John (xix. 4). At the same time, he tried a second means of making the acquittal more acceptable to them: 'Ye have a custom,' said he, 'that I should release unto you one at the Passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?' This question did not mean, Will you altogether approve that I should acquit Jesus? but, Is it right in your eyes that I should release Him under that form? The Jews might be induced to assent to that by two motives—first, because in this manner Jesus would be publicly designated for one moment as a real offender, a malefactor subject to the law—because He would be at least set forth as a fanatic deserving pity, and would be visibly destroyed in the estimation of the people if he were thus dismissed with disgrace, which must appear to their hatred still more desirable than if he, without any further concern, went away acquitted; and, in the second place, because in this way Pilate gave an opportunity for the exercise of a customary right in the most obvious manner,—

[1] Neander, 461.

[2] 'A twofold scourging was in use among the Romans. The one was inflicted on those who were already condemned to crucifixion. It was so barbarous, that the criminals often gave up the ghost during its execution. Further, scourging was also applied without the consequent punishment of death, *either to bring delinquents to some sort of confession*, or to punish them for a crime. The latter kind of scourging was what Pilate allowed to be inflicted on Jesus. It was not inferior in cruelty to the former, although its severity depended wholly on the will of the magistrates.'—Friedlieb, 114. On the difference between the Jewish and Roman scourging, see Sepp, iii. 510.

a right of which we know nothing accurately as to how it originated—to whose exercise, however, they attached a considerable value.[1] By this proposition Pilate might still suggest some hope, especially to the disposition of the people—to the disposition of the many worshippers of Jesus among the people.

But he made a mistake when, in this manner, he forsook the path of righteousness to tread the by-road of false political craft. He did not perceive what cunning powers were opposed to him in this operation. The people were already prepared for his proposal—the masses already knew their watchword; and hardly had he uttered the proposition that Jesus should now be released as the poor sinner of the Passover—favoured by the people—than the crowd began to cry out, 'Not this man, but Barabbas.' Nay, according to Mark, many of the people seem to have broken forth before the right moment with the word which had been taught them by the high priests, as they began to cry out that he should, according to the customary right, release to them one prisoner at the feast (ver. 8).

The frightful comparison between the person of Jesus and that of Barabbas, did not thus proceed from Pilate; it was the idea of the high council, and was carried out by the Jewish people. This comparison was extremely characteristic—a bringing into comparison of Christ with the dark counterpart of His personality, pure as light. That criminal was one prominent

[1] That the Israelites were glad to execute great criminals at festivals, appears entirely (as Sepp supposes, iii. 502) to refer to a parallel between their mis-doers and the scapegoats, which were slain on the great day of atonement; and therefore their disposition also to release a prisoner at the feast might be referred to the goat, which was let go free into the desert (Lev. xvi. 22). Sepp supposes that this custom was very ancient among the Jews. But since up to the time of Pilate they had lost their domestic jurisdiction over criminal offences to the Romans, they would have acquired for it the right alluded to, by which that old custom was maintained. This observance may have originated all the more easily, that even the Romans at all times were accustomed, at the Lectisternia and Bacchanalia, to allow an amnesty for criminals. From the passage of John, indeed, follows nothing more than that Pilate, and perhaps also his predecessors, had adopted this custom.—Friedlieb, iii. [Some, with apparent justice, found on John xviii. 39, '*Ye* have a custom,' and conclude that this was purely of Jewish origin. So Bynæus, and Gerhard, who thinks that the liberation of prisoners was appropriate at a feast which commemorated the deliverance from Egyptian bondage. See also Ewald, p. 480.—ED.]

above others. He was in chains, because he had taken part in bringing about an insurrection in the city, probably even had headed it, and therein had committed a murder (John and Luke). This was actually the form of criminal that the enemies of Jesus would have liked to make of His person, in order to inflict death on Him. Even the name of the criminal in this connection is remarkable also; Barabbas means the Son of the Father.[1]

The Jewish people, in an election, which has become the world-historical type of all popular elections misguided by seducing demons and exaggerated in themselves, asked for the release of this black criminal, and therewith rejected Jesus, who had been compared in value with him. In this act the form of Christ had become changed for the enemies of Jesus into the form of Barabbas, the form of Barabbas into the form of Christ. Such had been the web woven among them by the spirit of lies. This was the first act of the last formal rejection of Christ—the first degree of the world-historical expression of the rejection of the Messiah from the interests of the Jews to the heathen.

But Pilate was not at once in the mind to yield to the demand of the Jews. Rather he continued his purpose to abide by the execution of his sentence. Therefore he caused the Lord to be led away to be scourged. Those who were thus punished were bound to a post, generally chained in a bent position to a low post, so that the naked back, tightly stretched, was exposed to the severe stripes. The scourge consisted of sticks, or else of leather thongs, to which was given a special force in weight and swing, by loading the ends with lead or bone. The execution

[1] According to a reading of Origen, he must have, besides, borne the surname of Jesus. Olshausen has found a significance in both the names in connection with the personality which here represented the mournful caricature of Jesus. Strauss mocks at it (ii. 501), whereby he must assume that names could never gain an ironical meaning for those who bear them, and wherein he must overlook the fact, that Barabbas was actually the caricature which the Jews wanted to make of Jesus. [The reading, *Jesus* Barabbas, is adopted by Ewald, Meyer, and others, but rejected by Tischendorf, Alford, and Ellicott. Ewald (p. 480) thinks the similarity of the name might suggest him to Pilate as a substitute for Jesus. So also Meyer on Matt. xxvii. 16. Ewald and Renan (406) prefer Bar-Rabban (Son of a Rabbi) to Bar-abbas; and on the connection between the titles Abba and Rabbi, see Ewald, p. 233.—Ed.]

lacerated the back of the victim; it might result in fainting, or even death. In this manner Christ was scourged by the Roman soldiers.[1] That they could not have performed their office with any forbearance, is plain from the wanton malice with which they added mockery to the scourging. Moreover, it was to Pilate's interest that Jesus should be fearfully beaten; because he hoped to spare His life by means of the disfigurement in which he would bring Him before the Jews.[2]

The moment had arrived in which the Roman band of soldiers gave way to the strong reaction of their wild heathenish feeling, against the deep awe with which Christ had inspired them on the previous night. It is in itself a natural impulse of the rude mind, to seek to shake off uncomfortable impressions of slavish awe with a daring show of bravado. Hence the diabolical excitement into which the soldiers were wrought by the circumstances of Christ's ill treatment with Herod, and by the tumult of the Jewish people. It was an hour of the licence and triumph of all the gross tumultuary powers in humanity—of their public revolt against the Anointed of God; under the eyes, with the permission, and the approving laugh of civilised and high authorities. The rude humour of the diabolical excitement inflamed the soldiery; they determined to finish the game which the soldiers of Herod had begun to play.[3] Upon the claim of Jesus to the royal dignity in the white robe (the costume of Roman candidates), must follow His crowning in a purple robe of state, and the homage belonging thereto, as it was usually practised in earnest, and still more often in jest.[4]

[1] Generally the scourging was inflicted by lictors. But Pilate, as subgovernor, had no lictors at his disposal, and therefore had it inflicted by soldiers. Thus Jesus was probably not scourged with rods, but with a scourge twisted of leather thongs.—Friedlieb, 115. [Full details and ancient authorities may be seen in Bynæus (iii. 131, et seq.). Between the rods and the thongs he makes the distinction, 'Liber virgis, servus cædebatur flagellis;' and quotes the following lines from Prudentius:—

'Vinctus in his Dominus stetit ædibus, atque columnæ
Adnexus, tergum dedit, ut servile, flagellis.'—Ed.]

[2] On the frightful weight and effect of the Roman scourging, and the shocking thirst for blood of the Romans of that time generally, comp. Sepp, iii. 511: 'Still the sufferings of Jesus have ever thus testified their redeeming power; so that where His word penetrated, this arbitrariness decreased from day to day.'—Rauschenbusch, *Leben Jesu*, 409.

[3] Friedlieb, 116. [4] Compare Friedlieb, 117.

With this purpose they led Him into the hall of the prætorium, and called together thither all their comrades, the whole company. First of all the crowning was set about. The soldiers plaited a crown of thorns,[1] and placed it on His head. They knew not that Jesus had now become king of patience in the great and holy kingdom of undeserved suffering, which is converted by God's righteousness and faithfulness into the kingdom of glory. Then came the investiture. They stripped Him, which probably means, they took from Him His upper garment. Although they had stripped Him also before the scourging, yet it was part of the ceremony that He should be first of all invested again with an upper garment, and formally divested of it. But probably it was the very white robe from the house of Herod which they first threw over His naked shoulders, and immediately again took off, in order perfectly to represent the ironical coronation. Then they adorned Him in their manner with the princely purple cloak, for which, according to Matthew, a plain pallium must have served—a war-cloak, such as princes, generals, and soldiers wore, dyed with purple: probably, therefore, a cast-off red robe of state out of the prætorian wardrobe.[2] Hereupon they gave Him the sceptre, a reed-staff,[3] pressed into His right hand. According to Matthew, the hand seems to have grasped the staff. But John omits this point; whence, perhaps,

[1] It is just as little possible accurately to define the kind of thorns with which Christ was crowned, as has been frequently attempted (Sepp, 513; Friedlieb, 119), as it is reasonable with Paulus to make of the thorns mere hedge shrubs. [Of the attempts to identify the species of thorn, Bynæus says (iii. 145): 'Nemo attulit aliquid certi, et profecto afferri omnino nequit.' The remark of Ellicott (p. 348, note) should be kept in view: 'As *mockery* seems to have been the primary object, the choice of the plant was not suggested by the sharpness of its thorns: the soldiers took what first came to hand, utterly careless whether it was likely to inflict pain or no.' However, there can be little doubt that they would prefer a painful mockery, if that were equally at hand.—ED.]

[2] Matthew here declares exactly that the cloak was a plain pallium, dyed with coccus. The designations in Mark and John, purple, and purple robe, are not merely explained by saying, 'that the two names of purple and coccus are often interchanged because of their similarity,' but rather, perhaps, from the circumstance, that these Evangelists already have in view in the expression the symbolical purpose of the robe.

[3] Probably a so-called reed of *Cyprus* (now called a Spanish reed).—Sepp, iii. 516.

it may be concluded that the staff did not remain in His hand. It is here hard to say what the pure passivity of the holy One did in this case. But if we suppose that the hands of Jesus were bound, it is manifest that the staff might rest for a time in His hand without His holding it. Upon the clothing, the mocking homage occurred—bowings of the knee, and greetings, as they generally were: 'Greeting (Hail to Thee), King of the Jews!'

But even the mockery was not yet sufficient for the spirit of outrage which had intoxicated them; it carried them on beyond this to the grossest ill-treatment. They gave Him blows with sticks; took the staff of reed, and struck Him with it on the head, and spat in His face. If we suppose that the reed might have fallen from His hand, this circumstance might perhaps have furnished a reason for the soldiery passing on from mockery to ill-treatment. They wanted then to chastise Him with the blows of the sticks; because he had not held fast the reed, they picked it up with irritation, and struck Him on the head with it, in order to drive the crown of thorns more deeply into His flesh, and exhausted their rage by spitting its foam into His face.

Thus was the Messiah rejected of the Jews to the heathen, and received by the general heathen world; after the elected ones of the heathen world had previously saluted Him,—Magi from the east, pious Grecians from the west. Even this mockery and ill-treatment Pilate appears to have been not sorry to see. When this cruel usage was finished, he came before Jesus on the open square, and said to the people, 'Behold, I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in Him.' These words only have a meaning on the supposition that Pilate must have considered the scourging of Christ as torture —as a torture by which nothing had been elicited from Him which betrayed His guilt. At the same time, he might wish to make manifest, by the appearance of Jesus in the obtrusive mocking masquerade of the kingly attributes, that He jested at the political danger which had been attributed to the accused. When Pilate had thus announced the appearance of Jesus, the latter was actually brought before the people, and shown to them with the crown of thorns upon His head, and clothed with the purple mantle. At His appearance, Pilate broke forth

into the expression, 'Behold the man!'[1] From the brief and very pregnant form of the words, it might perhaps be concluded that a better feeling had overcome his worldliness in this expression: the latter feeling would have probably been uttered in a more declamatory manner. The exclamation of the judge has been with reason regarded by the Church as an involuntary prophecy of this moment of suffering, extorted from his feeling by the power of Christ's appearance. His first conscious feeling is connected with the most unconscious by a series of links. Behold the man! It is as if Pilate would exclaim, There He is—the poor man—a spectacle for compassion; as if in this deepest misery the *Man* first of all appeared to us again in His full human form, and awakened our entire human feeling. The Roman knew not in what measure He prophesied. According to his conscious purpose, however, he wished, doubtless, by his words, to preach sympathy and compassion to the high priests and their attendants, by the sensible effect of Christ's appearance. But the heathen man of the world preached humanity in vain to the Jewish hierarchs. As soon as they saw the man appear in the crown of thorns, they became deeply irritated, and cried, 'Crucify, crucify Him!' The sorrowing Messiah is to the Greeks foolishness—to the Jews an offence: this moment proves this. The heathenish mind, in its disposition to worship fortune, and to count misfortune as sin, or even as a curse, cannot at all perceive the power in the idea of triumphant and redeeming sorrow: therefore it is laughable to it; and the representation of this idea seems to it to be involved in a foolish fanaticism, which deserves compassion. But the Jewish mind is able to perceive so much of the truth of that idea, and of its confirmation in Christ, that the momentary appearance of it results in offending and agitating it in the strongest manner in its ardent but darkened worldliness. Therefore Jesus, in the present pomp in which He appeared as the jest of the heathen world, and in Him the idea of a King of the Jews, served for a mockery to the heathen world—became to them more odious than ever. It is extremely characteristic, that immediately a

[1] The tradition which still shows in Jerusalem the arch, 'Ecce homo,' on which Pilate placed Christ before the people, with the words, 'Behold what a man it is!' (see Von Raumer, *Palästina*, 291), reasonably assumes that Jesus was placed as a spectacle to the people upon an elevated place.

frightful paroxysm of rage was developed in them at this view of Jesus—a hurricane which carried them altogether into the position of the heathens, without their being conscious of it, seeing that they now themselves dictated for the Lord the heathen punishment of the cross in the cry and roar, 'Crucify, crucify Him!' This was the second degree of rejection wherewith the Jews delivered their Messiah to Pilate.

Pilate appears to have felt in a lively manner the inconsistency of the position of the Jews on the heathen standing, in themselves determining the punishment of the cross for Jesus. He answered them mockingly, 'Take ye Him, and crucify Him: for I find no fault in Him.' He mocked in these words, indeed, not merely the desire for the punishment of the cross, which had taken possession of them; but also the insolence with which they wanted to bluster him out of the execution of this sentence. But the assertion that He found no fault in Jesus, they at once contradicted. 'We have a law,' said they, 'and by this law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God.'

They thus for a while dropped their political complaint, because they saw that they did not prevail with this, and went back to their Jewish theocratic accusation, charging Him with blasphemy. Thus also they returned mediately to their first claim, that Pilate had only to confirm and to execute their sentence of death.

But as now in the wild medley of passions and authorities they had previously, by the political charge and the Roman sentence of punishment, hurried themselves into the position of the worldly judge, so the Roman also now grasped at that to which he was not competent, and adopted the position of the theocratic judge, in wishing to come to a decision upon the last charge,—that Jesus had, by the statement that He was God's Son, blasphemed God, and for it had deserved death,—and to decide it by his own proper investigation. Certainly it is chiefly probable that fear induced him to this attempt. For a long time, as John intimates, Jesus had inspired him with a slavish awe or terror; but this terror increased considerably after he had heard the last words of the Jews about Jesus. He remembered now probably the account of the soldiers of the occurrence in Gethsemane, and his wife's dream gained for him a new significance. The notion

of gods and sons of gods who appear disguised upon earth, and might be here denied or mistaken by men, and thus leave to them the curse—this was proper to the heathen world-view; and the more Pilate, in his unbelief, in the moments of his common pleasure might fancy that he was above that notion, the more powerfully it would come over him again in the moments of the reaction of his superstition to terrify him. He thus wanted to come to some clear idea of the personality of Christ, which threatened to become more and more uneasy to him. He withdrew again into the prætorium, and began the trial again. 'Whence art Thou?' asked he of Jesus. He asked Him not in the social meaning, but he wanted to have some information about His spiritual descent. But on that subject Christ could give no account to him in the form of judicial treatment. He was silent (Matt. ver. 12; Mark, ver. 5). This silence astonished Pilate. 'Speakest Thou not unto me?' he asked Him; 'knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and power to release Thee?' On this answered Jesus to him: 'Thou couldest have no power at all against Me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin.' The two passages separately are quite plain, but their connection is somewhat obscure. In the first portion, Jesus maintains the freedom of His position before Pilate. He has yielded Himself up, not to the might of Pilate, but to the power of God, who has given to Pilate power over Him. Thus He characterizes the Roman as the unconscious instrument of the high providence to which He, with consciousness and freedom, resigns Himself. But then, in the second portion of the passage, He characterizes him as the slavish, sinful instrument of violent men, who are bringing about His death. They, says Christ, have the greater sin; and thus is declared that Pilate likewise is a sinner, in that he is intending to become a contemptible tool of the Jews. But how does the second passage flow from the first? This fact that Jesus was given up to the power of Pilate, has been occasioned and brought about by the great guilt of the Jews in rejecting their Messiah. Thus follows from this fact, that the guilt of the Jews is greater than that of Pilate. This statement of Jesus appears to have much struck Pilate. He felt that in moral relations Jesus stood before him as a judge; that He looked through him, treated him as a

poor sinner,—so accurately and yet so justly He measured his guilt. And from thenceforth, says John, in his emphatic manner, Pilate sought to release Him. He had indeed hitherto taken much pains for this purpose, but rather in a playful manner. But now, for the first time, he shows himself decidedly as one who throws his whole earnestness into it. He demanded now of the Jews that they should specify definite facts, on account of which Jesus was to be declared a malefactor. Thus he declared that he would not have regard to the last suggested but not proved charge of alleged blasphemy. But just as little were the Jews inclined to engage in the proof. Instead of proof, they rather began to cry out still more excitedly, that Jesus must be crucified. But in order to give emphasis to their cry, they returned to their first charge, that Jesus was a seditious person, and declared that they would assert this charge before Cæsar himself against the judgment of Pilate. They threateningly cried out, 'If thou let this man go, thou art no friend to Cæsar: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar.' As the imperial governors, as well as the princes dependent upon Rome, were named by the title of honour, 'Friend of Cæsar,'[1] the Jews gave it by this appeal to be understood by Pilate, by a mischievously ingenious ambiguity, that there would be an end of his governorship as soon as he released Jesus; because they would then accuse him to the Cæsar as the friend of a revolutionary Jewish pretender to the crown. This trial was too strong for the soul of Pilate. For a long time he had had no easy conscience concerning his government of Judea hitherto, and could not thus but fear to drive the Jews to extremes, to induce them to appear in Rome with a complaint against him.[2] He knew also that it was not according to Roman policy, in popular disturbances in the provinces, to defend the right at any price, especially the right of individuals, but that the State in such cases was accustomed to make very considerable concessions to the turbulent feeling of the people.[3] But what

[1] Sepp, iii. 519.

[2] He did not indeed escape this destiny, since subsequently he was complained of on account of his acts of violence, and deposed. [The history of Pilate is continued in Josephus' *Antiq.*, xviii. 4; and his tragic end briefly mentioned by Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, ii. 7.—ED.]

[3] Compare Acts xviii. 17.

most deterred him from the purpose of defending the life of the accused, was the fear of the anger of the Cæsar Tiberius, who, with the distrust of a despot, encouraged informations in respect to politically suspected persons, and to whom it might very easily appear an unpardonable crime if his officials in the provinces were to discourage such informations.[1] This fear turned the scale. Hardly had Pilate aroused himself strenuously to maintain the right, than the temptation which threatened him with the fall from the height of his worldly prosperity overcame him. When he heard that saying, says the Evangelist,—the threatening of the Jews, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment-seat, in a place that is called the Pavement, 'high place;' but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha.[2] He was afraid now also perhaps of the appearance of having conversed with Jesus too long in private in the prætorium, and of not having carried on the proceedings in the strict form, throned on the judgment-seat; therefore he hastened first of all to restore the formal proprieties. He had mounted the judicial throne first of all to release Jesus. He ascended it the second time to condemn Him. Meanwhile a long time had elapsed before it came to this. John specifies the time of this event, because it was the critical moment, in the way that he generally likes to fix the time of such events (chap. xi. 39). He says it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour. It was about the time of noon.[3] Pilate

[1] Majestatis crimen omnium accusationum complementum erat.—Tac. *Annal.* iii. 38.

[2] 'The form of the judgment was not prescribed, but it was to be brief and valid. Usually it was, "*ibis ad crucem.*" But the reasons of the sentence might be added.' Adrichomius gives a formula which he professes to have taken from ancient annals, as the judgment of Pilate.—Friedlieb, p. 112.

[3] The specification of the hours was often made indefinitely according to the four divisions of the day,—about the first or the third hour, etc. If John, however, says that it was now about the sixth hour, while Mark says it was the third hour when they crucified Him, it appears to prove a contradiction. Moreover, I cannot solve this, as Tholuck and others, by the supposition that John is here following the calculation of the hours in the Roman form, and Mark the Jewish mode. For it is plain that the members of the Sanhedrim did not hold their last sitting till six o'clock in the morning; and from that time till the final sentence of Jesus, so many intervening circumstances occurred, that after their lapse it could no longer by possibility be about six o'clock in the morning. If we suppose that it was some time past nine o'clock, John might write that it was about the sixth hour,

was now proudly seated on the judgment-seat. But it was as if from henceforward his consciousness was entirely wavering in an alternation of cowardly dejection and ironical haughtiness. The more the supremacy of the Jews had inwardly overcome him, the more unbecomingly he sought to bring out his external supremacy. 'Behold your King!' he cried, mockingly, to the people, as he pointed to Jesus. It appears as if he had, in exasperation, wished to throw back on them the reproach that he was not Cæsar's friend. The Jews, however, cried out, 'Away with Him, away with Him; crucify Him!' And to the sarcastic question of the judge, 'Shall I crucify your King?' the high priests declared, 'We have no king but Cæsar.' Therewith they renounced altogether the theocratic hope of the Messiah, in order only to satisfy their thirst of blood against Jesus. It was the third and last step of the rejection of the Messiah to the hea-

since the times of the day were named separately in relation to the third, sixth, and ninth hour, those times being appointed for prayer (Friedlieb, 126). The sixth hour was kept holy by the Jews, especially on the Sabbath-days, and probably also on feast-days. Josephus (*Vita*, 54) tells of a stormy gathering of the people, which was dissolved by the consideration of the near approach of the sixth hour, which was especially strictly observed among the Jews (Wieseler, 411). Sepp (p. 531) wishes to bring out, from consideration of the astronomical relations, that it was about eleven o'clock in the forenoon, or somewhat after, describing the day as a summer day. But apart from the observation that the numbering of the hours among the Jews remained alike, in all probability, at all seasons of the year, reckoning from six o'clock in the morning, it is especially to be had in mind that the 7th April, on which Jesus was crucified, is not far beyond the spring equinox, at which the day begins at six o'clock. The main point is perhaps that John means to say that the sacred hour of noon, which had hurried the Jews (and mediately Pilate) to the conclusion of their transaction, had already drawn near, when Pilate sate down on the judgment-seat to complete the judicial sentence. But when Mark writes that it was the third hour when the crucifixion of Jesus began, and thus refers us to the time after nine o'clock in the morning, it is to be considered that the Synoptists, who regarded the details of Pilate's waverings less than John, reckoned the scourging of Christ and the crowning with thorns as an introduction to the crucifixion (see Note 2). Thus the special hour of the crucifixion, which Mark puts forward by way of supplement, is referred to the retrospect of the whole course of events from the moment when the crucifixion began, according to the view of the Synoptists, with the scourging (ver. 15), to the moment when it was completed (ver. 24), and is thus dated at the beginning of the scourging. [The early opinions are carefully collected by Bynæus (iii. 178-94), and the recent may be seen in Andrews, p. 457-9.—Ed.]

thens. They threw away even the hope of the Messiah, as well as the person of Jesus, to the heathen, in order that they might destroy this personality. After this assertion, the Jews rightly fell altogether under the Roman power. But equally also Pilate had fallen under the diabolical power of the Jews hostile to Christ, and he determined to deliver the object of their persecution to them to be crucified.

To deliver him, we must say with John; and Matthew explains to us more particularly how this is to be understood. As the disturbance against Pilate waxed greater to an uproar which wore the appearance of a legitimate revolt in the interest of the Roman Cæsar, against the pretended political unfaithfulness of Pilate; and as he was unable any longer to resist the tempest of threats, he took water and washed his hands before the people, saying, 'I am innocent of the blood of this just man,[1] see ye to it' (it is now your affair). Then answered the whole people, 'His blood be upon us, and upon our children.'[2] Pilate imagined

[1] Strauss thinks that the handwashing, as an expression of purity from blood-guiltiness, was a *specifically* Jewish custom, according to Deut. xxi. 6. *Specifically?* Can that be gathered from the passage quoted? Does it at all say that the handwashing of this kind was not the custom among the heathens? How comes the critic here in possession of that expression, 'specifically?' He thinks, moreover, that Pilate could not have cared much for intimating his innocence of the death of Jesus. In fact, the critic here blackens Pilate above measure, contrary to the testimony of the Evangelist, who is not at all willing to characterize the condemnation of Jesus as a trifling matter, which could not have given much anxiety to so great a man of the world. That the washing of the hands was acknowledged both among the Greeks and Romans as a sign of innocence, comp. Ebrard, 432; Sepp, iii. 525. And even although 'nothing similar is found in Roman trials' (Friedlieb, 123), still Pilate might have been led to its performance by his familiarity with the meaning of a symbolical treatment, even if the Jewish view had not induced him to it; for it is not to be forgotten that the events of the evangelic history exercised a peculiarly exciting influence over the feelings, which might suggest the formation of proverbs and practices, and so also the invention upon the spur of the moment of a symbolical treatment.

[2] 'But this is evidently only expressed from the Christian standing.' Strauss evidently makes this observation (ii. 504) on the supposition that it is not possible for a raving crowd of people to express an imprecation of the kind intimated; or, on the other hand, that it is not permissible, 'in the misfortune which soon after the death of Jesus broke over the Jewish nation in stronger and stronger shocks,' to seek to discover the blood-guiltiness which arose from the execution of Jesus.

thus at last to consent to the demand with which the Jews had come to him at the first,—namely, that he would merely *confirm* and *execute* their sentence of death. But therein he deceived himself, and thus the ceremony had none the more truth in it that he washed his hands to confirm his innocence. Had he done this immediately at the beginning, at the bringing before him of Jesus, and in the conviction that he was therein allowing a right of the Jews to decide in religious matters on life and death, his cause at least would have been wholly different from what it was now,—when for some hours the proceeding had been opened against Jesus, and it could no longer be discontinued,—when he could no longer abandon the accused to the Jews with conviction, but only with cowardly ignoble fear, and against his own conviction. As powerless as was his ceremony of cleansing from sin, so powerful was the imprecation of the Jewish people; and subsequent times have learned how terribly it has been accomplished.

In this moment the three great powers of human association combined—the hierarchy, political power, and the people—to condemn the Lord of Glory to death: the hierarchy, in the double mummery of political subjection, and of the most abject demagogic popular infatuation; political power, in the whole show and pomp of its independence, righteousness and humanity in its deepest humiliation, under the imperious caprices of the hierarchy and of the mob; the holy people, the pretended everlastingly free people, in the complete form of the *no people*, of the mob, rejecting in fanatical uproar its rightful Lord, revolting in hypocritical devotion for the Cæsar, against his representative. Where can be seen political tyranny, legitimate hierarchy, and mob-uproar, in a wilder medley than here, where all political powers have united to raise themselves in one great diabolical chaos against the Prince of the kingdom of God? (Ps. ii.)

The Jewish hierarchy is the most deeply guilty; next to that, the people of the promise, which is here changed by its own agency into a people of the curse. It cannot, indeed, be asserted that here it was, in the main, the same voices which cried out the 'Crucify Him, crucify Him,' against Jesus which a few days before hailed Him with the hosanna. There the best of the people appeared in the foreground, here the worst; and

only a medley of slavish and wavering minds would find themselves here again among the rabble of the high council, who had then attached themselves to the royal priestly people of the Messiah. But where in this case were the better ones who had shouted hosanna! Thrice resounded the great liturgy of death spoken by the Jews on the temple mountain against the Messiah, Crucify, crucify Him! There was heard no contradiction. Thus had the elected people fulfilled against itself the doom of self-rejection. Moreover, even the heathen world had doomed itself. Greek civilisation and Roman justice had become, in the person of Pilate, the servants of the Jewish fanaticism which was hostile to Christ. The mighty worldly pomp, the nursery of civic right, had become a slavish executioner of a degraded priestly caste, and of an inquisition hostile to humanity. The entire old world accomplished the judgment of self-rejection in sealing the doom of the Prince of the new world, the inheritor of its blessing.

The rejection of Jesus was actually declared when Pilate released to the Jews their Barabbas. The spirit of Barabbas, the seditious man and the murderer, became thenceforth the gloomy genius of the political life of the people. This is proved by the history of the Jewish war. But whilst he was set free in triumph, Jesus was once more stripped of the soldier's cloak and dressed in His own clothes, and was hurried away to the place of execution.

Certainly this condemnation and leading to death of Jesus resulted, moreover, in the redemption and release of still another Barabbas, namely, of fallen man in general, as having committed sedition against God and murder against its brethren, and thereupon is fallen into the heavy bondage of sin. Christ goes away to release the prisoners who long for freedom.[1]

NOTES.

1. The circumstance that only Luke narrates the leading away of Jesus before the judgment of Herod, while all the other Evangelists are silent about it, is said by Strauss to result in this, that 'the conjecture must remain open that the anecdote originated in the endeavour to place Jesus before the tribunals assembled in Jerusalem in all possible ways, and to say that He

[1] See Sepp, iii. 526.

was indeed treated with contempt by all authorities not hierarchical, but that still His innocence was acknowledged either implicitly or explicitly, and that He Himself maintained before all His equal dignity and demeanour.' The critic has evidently observed something of the ideality of this characteristic of evangelic history, and it is this which induces him to question its being historical. The fact that Luke alone narrates the circumstance referred to, proves just as little as the contrasted phenomenon that Luke omits the execution of the scourging, whereupon the critic wishes to conclude 'that in Luke there was no actual scourging.'

2. The fact that among the Romans there was a twofold scourging,—the one which served for torture (quæstio per tormenta) or for punishment, the other as preparatory to execution (comp. Sepp. 509),—may enlighten us upon the difficulty which has arisen between the narratives of the two first Evangelists and that of John, in reference to the scourging of Jesus. We may beforehand, for instance, suppose without difficulty that Pilate allowed the same scourging which was at first intended as torture or as punishment, to satisfy the thirst for revenge of the Jews, to pass subsequently, when the execution was decided on, as its introduction. Thus the Evangelists might apprehend this scourging according to its different aspects. John regarded it according to the original motives under which Pilate had arranged it, and Luke also brings out this reference strongly (ver. 16). Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, represent the scourging, in its world-historical importance, as preparatory to, and the beginning of, the sufferings of the cross of Christ. Thence it is plain, moreover, that they take it away from its original connection, and place it at the close of the sufferings of Christ before Pilate's tribunal. Nay, even the apparent differences between the specifications of time of John and of Mark respectively, become set aside by this observation (see the above note). To suppose a twofold scourging, as Ebrard does (433), is not allowable, for this reason, that the act of scourging, of which the first Evangelist speaks, perfectly resembles that described by John, and referred to by Luke in its issue in the history of the crowning with thorns.

3. According to Von Baur's familiar criticism (see his above cited work, 163), 'this whole manner of treatment pursued by

Pilate proceeds from the interest of the Evangelist in order to roll back all the guilt from him, the executioner of the punishment of death, upon the Jews, the special contrivers of the death of Jesus,' etc. And yet in the section referred to it is the guilt of Pilate which is expressly spoken of. According to V. Baur's supposition, the author of the Gospel must have written so awkwardly as to have flatly contradicted his own idea and purpose! or rather, Herr von Baur is generally unfortunate here in his daring reference to him, contradicting, as it does, the text that he has given. But apart from that expression of Christ, 'He that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin,' does this description of Pilate's character in John give the impression that he comes out from this intercourse without guilt? Thus our critic appears to understand the judgment of moral character; '*he finds Pilate guiltless according to John.*' And the author of the Gospel is not only to remain guiltless, but also here to be the noble idealist who changes his ideas in a praiseworthy manner into fictitious histories, although he seeks to falsify the true character of Pilate, which has so much importance for the Church of Christ, in the very face of that Church. The picture of this idealist is a creation of Mr Von Baur, which may place itself according to his moral taste, free from reproach, and deserving of praise, near the guiltless Pilate of his pretented imagination. Comp. Thiersch, *Versuch zur Herstellung d. historischen Standpunktes für die Kritik d. N. T. Schriften*, p. xxiii.

SECTION VIII.

JESUS LED AWAY TO GOLGOTHA.

(Matt. xxvii. 31–33; Mark xv. 20–22; Luke xxiii. 26–33; John xix. 16, 17.)

In Jerusalem, the so-named street of suffering (via dolorosa, via crucis) runs from the northern foot of the temple-mountain in a westerly direction, somewhat inclining to the south, to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Tradition undertakes, in this street, to indicate the way by which Christ must have been led from the judgment-hall to the place of execution (Golgotha); nay, it points out several places in which special events of the history of the passion (of which the four Evangelists make mention, or which tradition records) must have occurred.

As for these stations, they belong, for the most part, to tradition. Even the road itself has been left to the decision of tradition; and, indeed, the genuineness of the point of departure indicated by tradition, and still more that of the point of destination, has been absolutely and decidedly questioned.

In respect of the place of departure, the genuineness of this may be not unreasonably denied; for it is much more likely that Pilate resided in the palace on the temple-mountain than in the palace at the foot of the city of David. If thus the destination—namely, the determining of the situation of Golgotha—be rightly specified by tradition, then the general direc tion of the via dolorosa must be rightly indicated; if, after the desolations that Jerusalem has undergone, anything can be said of the correctness of the direction of this street in general.

The authenticity of that locality, however, has been of late more established again than ever. For a long time it has been asserted that the place of Christ's crucifixion, as well as His grave, was outside the city of Jerusalem, while the place of the holy sepulchre that tradition has consecrated is enclosed by the walls of the city. But now lately it has been shown that the district of the crucifixion of Jesus, the new city (Bezetha) before the building of the walls of Agrippa, or up to the time of the death

of Jesus, had been situated entirely in the open ground.[1] This observation is more and more confirmed by the latest inquiries.[2] The testimony of the tradition, moreover, in this case, obtains an entirely special importance, because to the time of Constantine it searched after the place of the crucifixion of Christ exactly on a spot which must have had for the Christian mind much that would cause its rejection, since the Emperor Hadrian had built there a temple of Venus.[3] The Christians would not have been likely to have decided thus easily, without objective reasons, on consecrating this profaned spot to their holiest recollections.[4]

It must, besides, be mentioned in this behalf, that even the difficulty of identifying the traditional situation of the holy sepulchre with the statements of the evangelic accounts, testifies eventually for the truth of the tradition. For tradition could have contrived a much more easily comprehended account, as it appears, if in this case it had been willing to invent. Certainly there were not many ways open out of the city in which to seek a locality such as the evangelic history has designated as the place of the crucifixion.

If, indeed, the theatre of the crucifixion is to be sought for again on a mountain-top or a high hill, as Christian traditional poetry has suggested, the difficulty continues. But the Evangelists not only afford no pretext for such a proceeding, but they absolutely preclude such a notion, by speaking merely of the place of Golgotha, the place of skulls.[5] It is not likely that, by

[1] See K. V. Raumer, *Palästina*, 355; Scholz, *De Golgothæ situ.* Comp. Friedlieb, 137.

[2] Schulz, *Jerusalem*, 96. [3] See Note 1. [4] Schulz, 99.

[5] גלגלתא (the Chaldaic form for גֻּלְגֹּלֶת), properly the skull. 'According to old explanations, the hill must have either taken its name from its form, which resembled a human skull, or from the head of Adam, whose grave was placed there by tradition. Orig. in Matt. iii. 44.'—Friedlieb, 136. [Ewald thinks the name denotes a low, bare knoll, rising like a skull out of the ground. He identifies it with the hill Gareb of Jer. xxxi. 39, which also etymologically denotes a scraped, unfruitful, or scabby piece of ground. See his *Geschichte Christus*,' 485, note. The manner in which Luke names it 'the place called κρανίον' (skull, calvaria, Calvary), is against its derivation from the skulls of executed criminals lying about on the spot; for on this supposition some addition would almost inevitably have been made to the word (skull-heap or skull-hill), or, at least, it would have been given in the plural number.—Ed.]

this name, a hill formed like a skull is intended to be pointed out; rather it is suggested that the place received its name from the executions which occurred there. Moreover, that field was no even ground, but an elevated hilly place, which, according to its purpose of showing to the people those who were exposed to public ignominy, was appropriately prominent above the surrounding gardens, estates, and dwellings. If we seek for it in the place indicated by the tradition, it was a rocky tract which, according to the latest conjectures, ran out near the city into a projection which very probably fell away steeply towards the north and east.[1]

The heaps of rubbish under which a great part of the streets and squares of old Jerusalem lies buried, have obliterated the definite form of this elevation, by filling up the hollows that surrounded it.[2]

It was in accordance with the Israelitish as well as with the Roman custom, to execute malefactors in the front of the city.[3] And yet it was intended by the executions that they should occur in a crowded place, as also was the Roman custom. The new city was a district which at once answered both purposes.

Thus Jesus was actually led forth from the city by the street running from the temple-mountain westward, in order to be put to death before their gates,—among gardens, and country houses, and new buildings, and cultivated lands, in the centre of the glow and life of a growing new city,—and made a spectacle to the world![4]

Immediately the judgment of death was pronounced against the accused, it was probably urged by the Jews that He should be led forth to Golgotha as quickly as possible. For, according

[1] Schulz, 30. [2] Schulz, *in loc.*

[3] Heb. xiii. 13. Compare Grotius in the *Gospel of Matthew.* [Examples of execution without the gate of the city or the vallum of the camp may be seen in Bynæus (iii. 220) or Pearson *on the Creed* (Art. iv.). Taubmann, in his edition of Plautus (*Miles Glor.* ii. 4), quotes Lipsius as saying, 'Supplicia pleraque apud Romanos sumi solita extra portas; credo, ne frequenti sanguine et cæde contaminari oculi civium, aut delibari videretur libertas. Itaque et carnifex domum habuit extra urbem.' And so at Athens, and in other cities, the gate through which criminals were led to execution was called *χαρώνεια θύρα*. Ewald remarks (481), that the Jewish dread of contamination from dead bodies was sufficient reason for *their* executions being without the gate.—ED.]

[4] Compare Friedlieb, 113.

to their festival custom, they must wish that if possible the crucifixion should be completed before mid-day, and even that the crucified should be removed and placed in a grave before sunset. We may therefore suppose that the procession hastened towards the result in a rapid tumult.

Although Jesus now once more wore His own clothes, yet probably the traces of the ill treatment He had suffered were still plainly visible on His head and face. Instead of lictors, soldiers led Him forth, commanded by a chief (centurion) on horseback.[1] Together with Him were led forth to execution two malefactors. On a white tablet[2] the cause of His execution was recorded. We know not whether He bore it on His neck or whether it was carried before Him, for both modes were practised.[3] According to the usual procedure, Jesus was also required, on this rapid journey, Himself to bear His cross. Even although the frame of the cross had not that gigantic form and size in which it is commonly represented, it still must have been a grievous burden.[4] Added to this, the Lord, by the previous sufferings, had been already greatly shaken. The great labour of spirit and heart of the previous Passover-eve, the sharp struggle in Gethsemane, the night-watch, the separations, the rendings of His heart, finally, the frightful scourging,—all these precursors had exhausted His strength; and now the hasty leading away under the burden of the cross aggravated all His fatigues.[5]

[1] By Tacitus called 'Exactor mortis;' by Seneca, 'Centurio supplicio præpositus.'—Friedlieb, 128. Comp. Sepp, 533.

[2] It was called titulus, σανις, or also λεύκωμα, αἰτία. [According to the definition of Suidas, quoted by Pearson, the λεύκωμα was a tablet or table, whitened with a coating of gypsum, and commonly used for writing any public notices on. But whether this was carried before the Saviour or hung round his neck, seems uncertain, but the former much more probable; and so it is commonly represented in pictures of the Via Dolorosa.—Ed.]

[3] Friedlieb, 128.

[4] [Lipsius observes, that the whole cross was not always laid on the criminal, but sometimes only a part. In some cases this cross-bearing could not be observed, as when a man was nailed to a tree. Since Tertullian, it has been common to find a type of Christ's bearing His cross ('lignum passionis suæ bajulantis,' *Adv. Judæos*, c. 10) in Isaac's bearing the wood on which he was himself to be laid as the victim.—Ed.]

[5] It has been well observed that our Lord must not be conceived of as having been a man of exaggerated bodily powers, or as having had any faculties in disproportionate prominence; even in the susceptibility—the

In what concerns the previous spiritual exhaustion of His life, His struggle in Gethsemane had already agitated Him, even to death. But in what belongs to the bodily exhaustion, we know of the Roman scourging that it could in other cases sometimes inflict death upon the victim; and we may gather from the circumstances, how in this case all the rage of diabolical excitement had stimulated the stripes of the soldiers. Thus was the holy One exhausted when He was urged along under the burden of His cross. And He came, notwithstanding, with His burden before the gate. Whether He at length sank down here under the burden, as the tradition says, or whether He faltered, or whether the Roman soldiery, without that, were moved by a feeling of pity for Him, we cannot tell. In any case, they provided for Him a substitute to carry His cross forward, as soon as they had gone forth with Him out of the city. Possibly the centurion, who subsequently beneath the cross showed himself so deeply moved by the innocence and lofty dignity of Christ, felt already a peculiar attraction to Him, which induced him to interest himself in the exalted sufferer. This interest, indeed, displayed itself in a soldierly manner. Before the gate there met the procession a man, by name Simon of Cyrene (in the African Lybia, where many Jews resided[1]), who was coming from the country. The Evangelist Mark, at the time of the composition of his Gospel, knew him as the father of Alexander and of Rufus, two men who must have probably been known to the Christian Church of his time doubtless as partners in the faith.[2] Simon as yet perhaps stood in no very near relation to Jesus, at least he had during His sufferings before the Roman tribunal remained away in the country.[3] And perhaps the attention of

delicacy—the sensibility to injury of His perfect heroic manliness, and of the holy freshness and fulness of His life, He must needs have been the King of humanity.

[1] 'Ptolemy Lagos, when he received Palestine into his supreme authority, had 100,000 Hebrews settled in the Pentapolis of that place. They maintained a special synagogue at Jerusalem.'—Sepp, iii. 535. It is worthy of notice, in fact, that we find quoted in the Acts, xiii. 1, a Simeon Niger associated with Lucius of Cyrene, whereto Sepp calls attention. The tradition, on the other hand, that this man was Simon the leper, deserves no consideration.

[2] The similar names in Acts xix. 33, Rom. xvi. 13; have been referred to this place.

[3] Olshausen, *in loc.* [Bynæus suggests that he may have been coming

the procession was actually arrested by his coming up nearly to the gate thus alone in an opposite direction, while all the people were pouring forth from the gate in the company with Jesus. The soldiers thus laid hold on this man, and compelled him, in the form of a military requisition (*ἠγγάρευσαν*),[1] to carry the cross of Jesus after him. The distance from here to the place of execution, indeed, could not now be far.

Thus has many a man been suddenly involved in this world-historical crucifixion journey of Christ, coming as it were from the country, and has been compelled to bear the cross after Him. But many have quickly reconciled themselves to this blessed call, and have received the blessing of Christ for themselves and for their children, and in many ways have their names thereby been for ever rescued from oblivion.

Among the large crowd which followed Jesus were many who adhered to Him. For a long time it had appeared as if His dependants were unknown, and had vanished. They were struck dumb by all the terrors of hell, which were let loose upon Jesus. But now the first faint breezes of another disposition were beginning to breathe, the precursors of the courage of the cross would manifest themselves. And, indeed, these are first distinctly manifested in the weaker sex. A group of women began first of all to utter aloud their grief about the Lord; they lament Him, they lift up a loud wail over Him. The usual ceremony of the lament for the dead is not to be thought of here, for it was even forbidden among the Jews to lament in the customary manner a man who had been executed.[2] Here, then, the lament over Jesus proceeded from a mere deep sense of sorrow, so powerful that it even broke through the limits of customary observance without fear.

When the Lord heard the lament of these women, it seemed

in because it was a feast day. The supposition that he had been labouring, is certainly insufficiently supported. Meyer thinks he must have been a slave, and was therefore chosen for the degrading office, though so many Jews were around. But would a slave be at once known by his dress or bearing? And if the soldiers were heading the procession, is it not natural to suppose, that as Simon was meeting them, he would be most readily laid hold on?—ED.]

[1] On such requisitions compare Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, etc., 365. Upon the expression see above, vol. ii. p. 411.

[2] Compare Sepp, iii. 537.

to Him as if He saw Himself transplanted already into the tempest of destruction which was to come upon Jerusalem; and with the great sympathy of His faithful heart He turned and cried to the mourners, 'Ye daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. Then shall they begin (it will come to that with them that they begin) to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they *do* these things in the *green* tree, what shall be *done* in the *dry?*'

These sorrowing women lamented for the Lord in faithful kindness, but they did not understand the depth of what was occurring. They did not feel that they with their people were the unfortunate ones, a thousand-fold more so than He, and, indeed, on account of this very deed of His crucifixion; and this they were to know. The compassion with which they looked down upon Him as the poor Jesus, must give place to a terror with which they looked up for help in presentiment of their need to Him as the deliverer.[1]

Even in this glance upon the divine judgment which was to come upon Jerusalem, He grieved before all for the mothers—the poor mothers. He felt beforehand the nameless sorrows which were impending over most of them.[2]

Yea, even that frightful depth of wretchedness in which

[1] Olshausen remarks: We are not to think, as among this company of women, of those faithful women who, according to Luke xxiii. 48, looked on from a distance at the death of the Lord; for there, in fact, the words of the Lord were not appropriate. For, for the great visitation of doom of which Jesus spake, these would already have no need to fear. Here, indeed, nothing is said of needing to be afraid, but of the sorrows of love which even Christ Himself already experiences by anticipation with the mothers in Jerusalem; which thus even the godly faithful women must bear a part in, although they need not to be afraid in the common sense. But that the special female friends and disciples of Jesus from Galilee are not meant here, is certainly plain from the connection.

[2] Here is to be recalled that frightful event in the last siege of Jerusalem, that a mother killed her own child, roasted, and ate of it. Joseph. *de bell. Jud.*, vi. 3, 4; comp. v. 10, 3. Mothers snatched—how horrible!—the food out of the mouths of their own children; from the sucklings wasting away in their arms they did not shrink from taking away the last drop of milk, according to Gfrörer and W. Hoffmann.

afflicted Jews sought to hide themselves in the foulest corners, channels, and holes of the city before the whirlwind of shame and of death which foamed[1] through the streets and houses, when to many it would have seemed a great boon if mountains had covered them, or clefts of the rocks had hidden them,—all appeared in distinct view before the soul of the Lord.[2]

But He would clearly indicate the fundamental law of that divine doom. If they did *this* in the fresh green tree, who can say what would be done in the *dry* tree? If they put to death the holy One on the cross, who can fathom the judgments which then must be meted to this wholly withered, hardened world of sinners, which slew Him on the cross, according to eternal justice?[3]

Thus is the Lord, even on His journey to the death of the cross, so earnestly engrossed by the glimpse of the nameless sorrow which threatens His people, and especially the weak, the mothers, the loving among His people, that His own grief is forgotten by Him therein.

Pilate had immediately again taken courage, after the storm of Jewish excitement which had broken down his judicial dignity was appeased. But he had taken courage after his own manner. It was customary, as already mentioned, that the crime of the malefactors who were crucified should be specified on a tablet which was fastened over the cross. Pilate availed himself of this circumstance to avenge himself on the Jews for the humiliation that they had caused him. He put upon the tablet the inscription, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews; and to make the inscription intelligible to all, he had it written in the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman languages. He intended, without doubt, thereby to put a decided insult upon the Jewish nation; nevertheless, the greatness of the occasion made him in his turn an involuntary prophet, without his being aware of it. He was constrained to give to the Lord His rightful title—the

[1] Joseph. *de bell. Jud.*, vi. 8, 5; ch. ix. 4.

[2] 'Jerusalem was situate upon several hills, into whose subterranean depths fled the inhabitants in the later times of the siege. The hills were tumbled upon them, and the mountains covered them; for the city was made like to the earth, and the ruins filled up its valleys.'—Sepp, iii. 8, 38.

[3] Ezek. xx. 47; comp. xxi. 3.

dignity on account of which, in the most peculiar sense, He was crucified; and, indeed, to give it Him in the three great leading languages of the civilised world.[1] In the hurry and excitement of the procession, the Jews for a long time did not notice this inscription. But probably also by anticipation the arrangement was part of the revenge of Pilate, by which now the malefactors were led away with Jesus to be crucified with Him, at His right hand and at His left. Certainly the Jews might have had an interest in representing Jesus, by means of His execution between the thieves, as being the most notorious misdoer of all, and so in utterly degrading Him. But it turned the scale the other way when they reflected that these multiplied executions were mightily disturbing the repose of the feast-day, especially when they occurred at the hour of noon. And, moreover, in any case, the Jews could only have proposed to Pilate the execution of the two thieves with Jesus, but they could not themselves have determined upon it. But in the mood in which Pilate then was, this would probably have been a reason for not completing those executions, that he might not gratify the Jews. Pilate, on the other hand, in his vindictiveness, might feel actually induced to order the leading away from him with Jesus of the two thieves, who probably were already condemned to death, and were to be executed during the festival. His intention probably was to disgust his Jewish opponents with the procession to the execution of Jesus by these additions as much as possible, but especially to mortify them by crucifying the King of the Jews in the midst of criminals.[2] It was plainly to be understood that he would figuratively destroy the Jewish nation on the cross, with its fanatical notions of freedom, represented by the thieves and by Jesus, who must appear as their King; that he thus regarded the Jews one with another as a contemptible mob of robbers. He did not consider any further what the personality of Jesus was to suffer therein, since he

[1] Hase, 252.

[2] The account of John speaks for the supposition that the union of the execution of the thieves with that of Jesus was a thought of Pilate, and had the intention suggested above, especially the connection of the account of that offensive drawing up of that inscription with the ordering of the execution of the thieves in the words (ver. 19), Ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος.

prosecuted the thought of his vengeance, in requiting the public humiliation which he had experienced from the whole people by a great public degradation of the person of Jesus.

NOTES.

1. The reasoning by which Robinson (i. 408) seeks to invalidate the proofs adduced by Chateaubriand for the authenticity of the locality assigned to the holy sepulchre, is not satisfactory. The first supposition of Chateaubriand, that the Christian would have known the places of the crucifixion and of the holy sepulchre to the time of Hadrian, is not shaken, even although the tradition referred to were not supported by the regular succession of Christian bishops from the time of St James to the reign of Hadrian, for that tradition might exist without this succession. The second supposition, that the Cæsar Hadrian erected heathen temples about the year 135 upon Golgotha, and on the sepulchre, is not weakened by the fact of the intimations of this first occurring in Eusebius and Jerome, and that these writers are not strictly agreed with one another. As Jerome must have been very well acquainted with the topography of the later Jerusalem, and as his account stands to that of Eusebius in the relation of a more exact and complete narrative, it is not to be understood wherefore he should not deserve credit in the testimonies referred to. If Eusebius relates that godless men had built a temple of Venus over the sepulchre of Jesus, it is only more closely determined by Jerome by the first notice, that Hadrian had that temple built, and first corrected by the second, according to which the marble equestrian statue of Venus stood upon the 'rock of the cross,' but over the place of the sepulchre the figure of Jupiter. Moreover, when subsequently Sozomen relates that the heathen had erected these images in these places with the view of scaring away from them the Christians who made pilgrimages thereto, he maintains this assertion by distinct allusions to the fact, that the heathens had been at pains to make the holy places inaccessible to the Christians. Certainly the authenticity of the locality of the holy sepulchre is not in the abstract proved still. But if the above-mentioned circumstance be taken into consideration—and how hard it must have been for the Christians again to attach their reverence for the holy death-places of

Jesus to places thus desecrated!—the supposition that they were constrained thereto by the historical truth of the tradition, assumes a high degree of probability (comp. V. Schubert, *Reise*, ii. 504). The history of the holy sepulchre, see in Robinson, i. 373. [The arguments for and against the genuineness of the sites now shown as those of the crucifixion and of the holy sepulchre are very lucidly stated by Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 479–488. Ewald (485, note) observes, that it is not at all probable that the early Christians made pilgrimages to the tomb of their Lord, like Buddhists or Mussulmen, or even accurately marked it. But may we not justly ascribe to the early Christians at least as much interest in these sites and objects as exists among ourselves, and as has been sufficient to induce so many travellers to engage in the most arduous investigations?—ED.]

2. The cross was represented in three forms. 'The first was called "*crux decussata*," and had something the shape of the letter X. The second form, the so-called "*crux commissa*," was made by fastening a shorter beam in the middle, at right angles on the end of the upright one, whereby the cross resembled the letter T. The third form of the cross is the familiar Roman cross, where a shorter beam is so fastened at its middle, at right angles to another, that one portion of the actual trunk of the cross as it were projects above it. This cross is called "*crux immissa*."' The ecclesiastical tradition has decided that Christ's cross had the third form; and the 'more general opinion' of the testimony of the Church fathers, upwards to the earliest, speaks in favour of this assumption.—Friedlieb, 130. According to Lipsius, the cross must have been of oak. According to Cornelius a Lapide, it must have been put together of the several kinds of wood—palm, cedar, cypress, and olive. Certainly that wood was generally taken which came most conveniently to hand; as in Palestine, the sycamore, the palm, or the olive-wood (Id. 135). [All needful information regarding the cross is collected by Lipsius in his treatise, *De Cruce* (published separately at Antwerp 1595, and Amstel. 1670, and in the second volume of his collected works, Lugduni, 1613, pp. 765–802). Both Lipsius and Bynæus give well-executed plates of the various forms of the cross. The original definitions from which the above of Friedlieb are taken, are as follow:—'Est decussata, est commissa, est immissa. Illa prima mihi

dicitur, in qua duo ligna directa et æquabilia, inter se obliquantur (the St Andrew's cross). . . . Jam commissam crucem appello, cum ligno erecto brevius alterum superne, et in ipso capite committitur, sic ut nihil exstet (the T cross). . . . Denique Immissa crux est, cum ligno erecto transversum alterum injungitur atque immittitur, sed sic ut ipsum secet' (the Roman cross, as commonly represented in pictures of the crucifixion of our Lord). Attention should also be given to that essential part of the cross which is often overlooked—the short horizontal bar projecting from the middle of the cross, and on which the crucified was seated astride, as on a saddle, so that the weight of the body might not rest on the nails. This is very fully described by Salmasius in his treatise, *De Cruce*, extracts from which are given by Stroud, *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, p. 368, etc. The most ancient definition of this part of the cross is given by Justin Martyr (*Dial. Tryph.* sec. 91), *τὸ ἐν τῷ μεσῳ πηγνύμενον ὡς κέρας, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον, ἐστίν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι.* With Bynæus it is called the *sedile* of the cross.—Ed.]

3. 'Notwithstanding what Strauss says, the narrative of John, that Jesus, Himself bearing the cross, was led away, in no way contradicts what we must add to it from other sources,—that He was afterwards relieved of the burden on account of His exhaustion.'—Neander, 463. The expression, 'Notwithstanding what Strauss says,' is very well chosen here. In respect of the relation of John to the other Evangelists, the interlacing of the expressions is to be well considered, *βαστάζων ἐξῆλθεν* in John, and *ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον* in Matthew; comp. Ebrard, 436.

4. The tradition of the holy Berenice or Veronica has linked itself to the narrative of the women who lamented for the Lord. —Sepp, 537.

SECTION IX.

THE CRUCIFIXION—THE DEATH OF JESUS.

(Matt. xxvii. 33–56; Mark xv. 22–41; Luke xxiii. 33–49; John xix. 17–30.)

As soon as the representatives of the old world, who led the Lord away to crucifixion, were arrived with Him at Golgotha, the execution was prepared. They began it by offering Him a draught of benumbing effect—namely, a wine spiced with myrrh. They considered it an act of kindness to offer Him in the usual manner a means of stupifying Himself, and thereby of deadening His perception of the horrors and torments of the frightful death of the cross.

The inclination apparently to strengthen himself with intoxicating drink, is generally characteristic of the man of the old world immersed in the slavish life of nature. But he mostly believes that he is justified and instructed in arming himself by this means against sorrow and suffering, against tortures and terror. It is therefore not to be wondered at, if this custom was generally prevalent, especially in pre-Christian antiquity. The Roman soldier carried his wine with him, which was of an inferior quality, but was often strengthened in its effect probably by mixture with spices.[1] Among the Jews even in later times, it had become a prevailing custom to offer a draught of intoxicating and stupifying wine to those who were being led to execution;[2] and the Rabbis conceived that they saw therein a custom of pious gentleness, which they sought to base even upon a passage of holy Scripture.[3] Even in the days of the Christian

[1] Rosenmülleri *Scholia in Matt.* in loc. Compare Plautus, *Miles. Glor.* iii. 2, 23.

[2] Kuinœl, *Evang. Matt.* in loc. Friedlieb, 141; Sepp, 540. That it was a Roman custom to give such a draught to the condemned, as Olshausen observes, iv. 230, is not proved. [Lightfoot quotes from the Talmud, 'To those that were to be executed, they gave a grain of myrrh infused in wine to drink, that their senses might be dulled; as it is said, "Give strong drink to them that are ready to die, and wine to those that are of a sorrowful heart."'—Ed.]

[3] Prov. xxxi. 6. Compare the places referred to.

martyrs, it still occurred that sympathizing brethren in the faith, and friends of those condemned to death, offered in compassion such a cup to them on their journey to the place of execution.[1]

Even to the Lord this cup was thus handed. The Evangelist Matthew says, that they gave Him vinegar mingled with gall. It is evident that he selected this expression with distinct remembrance of a passage in the Psalms, in the text, 'They gave Me also gall for My meat, and in My thirst they gave Me vinegar to drink' (Ps. lxix. 21). But it is to be observed that he has not cited the passage, probably because the typical sign was not reflected again in its Christologic fulfilment with sufficient definiteness for his manner of consideration. In any case, it cannot be supposed that he would have designated the draught by an unfitting name for the sake of the text in the Psalms.[2] It was likely that only a bad sort of wine would be given to those who were led away to capital punishment, especially, moreover, if the wine was to be changed by the addition of bitter spices into a compound draught. Moreover, the ancients were actually accustomed to describe such poorer sorts of wine as vinegar wine, or slightingly even as vinegar.[3] Thus it was also natural to make the dose of bitters which was put into the wine as strong as possible, if it was required to make of it a stupifying potion for a condemned person.[4] And such an ingredient might then be characterized as gall.[5] The draught presented to Jesus must

[1] Neander, 464; Sepp, 541.

[2] As Strauss thinks himself compelled to assume, in order to make out a difference (ii. 514).

[3] Friedlieb, 141; Hug, 178. 'Between οἶνος and ὄξος, they (the ancients) had a medium ὀξίνης, tasteless as wine, and nearer to vinegar, but too weak for a good vinegar.'

[4] Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, 365: 'The Jewish Sanhedrim prescribed for this purpose a grain of frankincense, mixed with a cup of wine, which, according to Dioscorides, must have the distinct effect; but the same physician proposes myrrh also for this purpose, and we read also of its use in such a case in Apuleius.'—Sepp, 541. [These references, and many others, are given in the learned and valuable work of Bynæus above referred to (iii. 268). He quotes from Faber, 'Dioscorides notat myrrhæ vim inesse καρωτικήν. Ideo qui gravia subituri erant tormenta, quo fortius ea tolerarent, leviusque sensibus gravedine sopitis afficerentur, myrrham præsumebant.' And then the instances from the *Ass* of Apuleius are given.—Ed.]

[5] Friedlieb, 141: 'χολή is the Chaldee לְעָנָה, which everywhere signifies the bitter material,' etc. [Meyer and Alford refuse to reconcile Matthew

have had, according to Matthew's expression, the two qualities in the highest measure—it was as poor and as intoxicating as possible.

Thus the old world came also before the Lord with this supposed remedy of its ability. Sepp thinks that the pious women who lamented Jesus had prepared for Him this myrrh and wine. Thus it must have been a Jewish custom for the women in Jerusalem to interest themselves sympathizingly in the malefactors in this manner, and to care for them with the usual restoratives. But we cannot suppose that pious women, who lamented for the Lord, offered Him vinegar and gall.[1] Rather might we conceive of the ancient world as being represented in this case by an old but kind-natured enchantress, who knew no better counsel and comfort against the terrors of death and the mockery of hell, than her sense-confounding medicated wine.

Jesus received the cup handed to Him with divinely free simplicity. For He had been long athirst, after so many tortures and troubles of body and soul. He was athirst, but nevertheless He first of all placed the vessel to His lips to prove and taste it. But when He had tasted, He would not drink of it; He recognised at once the meaning of this draught. A whole world of temptations exhaled before Him from its intoxicating odour. It was as if the great world-delusion, which fancies that it actually overcomes the critical moments of life by reeling in intoxication over them, had accredited this cup to Him. And as, in that moment when He addressed the weeping women of Jerusalem, the unhappy mothers were present to His soul, who, in the destruction of the city, should fill it with their lamentations; thus He saw assuredly in the Spirit, at this moment, millions of unhappy men who sought for their strength in

and Mark on this point. Lightfoot supposes that Mark gives the cup its usual customary technical name; while Matthew specifies the ingredients actually mixed in this particular cup, which were, 'for greater mockage, and out of more bitter rancour,' vinegar and gall. Olshausen and Alexander agree with the author in supposing that the cheap sour wine of the soldiers is accurately named ὄξος, and that myrrh, gall, and other bitter substances are put for the whole class.—Ed.]

[1] Sepp will have it that the soldiers had taken away the 'rich and fiery wine' from the pious women, and substituted in its stead that poor and common draught.

the stupefaction of the intoxicating cup. Thus as He answered for His own soul, so reconciling and redeeming He became security for humanity, which even in this way, greedy and deceitful, charmed and chained by the dark wonder-powers of nature, wished to reel towards the abyss. He knew that there was still a struggle awaiting Him, which He could only undergo in perfect clearness of spirit. His pure soul revolted a thousand times more from the slavish condition into which the false use of the powers of nature can bring man, than from the benumbing effect of torture and anguish which might be made ready for Him by the world. And how could He have recourse to the stupifying slumbrous juices of nature,[1] when He had come to redeem the world from all sin, also from all the corruption of self-distraction, of self-darkening, and self-poisoning, by the misuse of the powers of nature,—from all mingling of the pure inspiration with the ecstasy of drunkenness,—from all superstition in magic potions and arts of poisoning,—when He recognised Nature herself in her dim life as a groaning creature, which He would glorify by the freedom of the children of God? Thus here, as ever, He asserted the heavenly perfection and divine dignity of His personality. He declined the draught, and, as the Evangelists significantly remark, He would not drink it. Although, probably, they would have constrained Him, He would not.

Thus He gave to the world a sign, and threw a light especially upon the carnal meaning in the supposed kindliness of the Rabbis, which pleased them so well.

We do not indeed read anything of His having condemned that cup in the abstract. For He knew well that poisons and medicines in nature are not absolutely opposed: as if, according to superstitious fancy perchance, the former were the creation of satan, and must of necessity always be hurtful; and the latter, on the other hand, were gifts of heaven, and must, under all conditions, operate healthfully. He knew well, that in the use of nature everything depends upon measure and relation; that man is to learn to value, to use, and to master everything in his spirit as a work of the Spirit. Thus freely He took the refreshing draught at the end of His struggle, just as He here, with royal repugnance, declined the stupifying cup.

[1] The Romans named a draught of this kind, expressively, '*Sopor*.'

In that moment when the soldiers fastened the cross in the ground, when they placed in order the instruments of torture, when they were preparing to draw Him up by cords, and to nail Him to the cross, even the rudest men among those who surrounded Him might have been seized with a feeling of horror; and the sympathizing spectators might think again and again that it would be better for Him to take a restorative after the usual manner. But although even His holy tender life trembled before the torture of the cross, as the lily quakes in the tempest, yet He suffered patiently in the great calm purity of His Spirit, till the rude hands laid hold of Him, stripped Him,[1] and drew Him up upon the cross.[2]

First of all, the outstretched arms were bound to the cross beams. The body rested in the middle, as if seated upon a projecting peg, that its weight might not tear down the hands from the nails with which they would be fastened. The feet also were bound. Hereupon came the nailing.[3]

And that it was not only the hands but the feet also that were nailed, is plainly deducible from the passage of Luke (xxi. 39); according to which, Christ, after His resurrection, showed to the disciples the marks of His crucifixion in His hands and feet. It is plain, besides, from the most definite testimonies of the old Church fathers, who lived in a time when the punish-

[1] On the unclothing, Friedlieb, 143. [Or Lipsius, *De Cruce*, ii. 7. Also, Apuleius has the striking comparison, 'naked as a new-born babe, or as the crucified.'—ED.]

[2] There was a twofold manner of crucifixion. 'Either the condemned were lifted up to the cross, already erected, or they were fastened to it while it was still on the ground; the former manner seems to have been the more usual.' The proofs of this are in Friedlieb, 142. [Lipsius shows that both modes were used. Of Pionius, the martyr, he quotes, that 'he divested himself of his garments, stretched himself on the cross, and gave the soldiers liberty to fix the nails,' and then 'eum igitur ligno fixum erexerunt.' But he shows that it was much more common first to erect the cross, and then to set the condemned on the small projecting bar and proceed with the fixing to the cross. It seems doubtful whether ladders were used for this purpose. Bynæus agrees with Salmasius in thinking that the ordinary height of the feet of the crucified above the ground was no more than three or four feet, although in some cases it was undoubtedly much greater. The hyssop stalk on which the sponge was presented to our Lord on the cross was only 1½ foot long; and the stroke of the spear was probably a level thrust, and not from below upwards.—ED.]

[3] Idem 144.

ment of crucifixion was still in use; which testimonies are likewise confirmed by the intimations of heathen writers.[1]

Negative criticism, which so timorously avoids the spirit of the prophecy how, according to the tradition, the Prince of this world was to be associated with the cross, will gradually lay less stress upon the assertion that the feet of Jesus were merely bound, if it finds that ecclesiastical theology of our day cannot any more lay altogether the same weight upon the reference of this fact to the text, Ps. xxii. 17, as the elder Church theologians have done.[2] It has become more ready to look without prejudice in this respect, since it no longer depends upon the hypothesis of the seeming death of Christ, and thus also needs no more to proceed on the supposition, that at His resurrection He must have had sound (unwounded) feet.[3]

But even although the feet of Jesus had not been pierced, the internal relation between His crucifixion suffering and the 22d Psalm would not be in the least degree set aside. This relation consists in the fact that the sacred singer, in a wonderful significant form of feeling (that is to say, lyrical-prophetical, not conscious and historical prophetical), by anticipation perceived and represented the sorrow of Christ, and that this representation, unconsciously to himself, but to the Spirit which inspired him consciously, expressed the most manifold sympathies in special features of the passion of Christ. To these sympathies belongs also the above-mentioned place in the Psalms.

After that Jesus had been thus nailed to the cross, the tablet with the inscription, Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, was fastened over His head. But as now the soldiers hereupon were prosecuting their duty, and crucified the two criminals on the right and the left hand of Jesus, it would for the first time be quite plain what this arrangement—namely, in connection with that inscription—must mean. Matthew has brought out the significance of this relation in a lively manner, by associating the crucifixion of the two thieves with the notification of that inscription.[4]

[1] Note 1. [2] Neander, 464. [3] Strauss, ii. 513.

[4] Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ, etc. As Strauss has not acknowledged the motive of the intelligent Evangelist in mentioning the execution of the thieves put here in this connection, he has come to the observation that Matthew refers to something of peculiar consequence.

The Jews observed immediately what this contrivance of Pilate implied. They found in it the bitterest outrage upon their nation. The circumstance excited the more attention, that the inscription was drawn up in the three great languages of the world.[1] This observation resulted in the rapid spreading of the intelligence of this affront into the city, and the hastening out of many citizens of Jerusalem to read the offensive inscription. John calls attention on this occasion to the circumstance, that the place of skulls was adjacent to the city, whereby it was easy for the offended people to run backwards and forwards between Golgotha and the city. The matter was so grievous to the Jewish popular spirit, that the high priests considered themselves engaged to present themselves to Pilate with the petition that he would correct the inscription; that it should be that Jesus had said of Himself that He was the King of the Jews. But the offended man, who had proved himself in the region of justice so helplessly weak, was acting now again in the element of his assumed power of stubbornness, of arbitrary power, of haughtiness, and of vindictiveness. He rejected the petitioners briefly and arrogantly with the word, 'What I have written, I have written.'

As if he had meant to say, You have, it is true, made me take back my spoken word, but my written word I will maintain inviolate. In what was written he would abide immoveably. Thus he spoke not only in the reaction of his wounded obstinacy against his fickleness, but also in accordance with the laws of his administration of the bureaucracy which he represented; and especially he spoke thus as a Roman.

This was not the last time that Roman pride with arrogant assurance uttered the words, What I have written, I have written.

Thus the rulers of the Jewish people were sent home from Pilate with a fresh humiliation. For at this moment the retribution was beginning quietly to operate which made the Jewish people a contempt and a scorn for all peoples; for that the Jews in rejecting Christ had cast away the inmost heart of their nationality—their glory. Thus it was ordained of God, that the crucifixion of Christ itself was to assume a form whereby it would become a disgrace to the Jewish nation.

[1] On the characterizing of these three languages by the Jews, see Sepp, 549.

This decision appeared to favour the honour of Jesus. But the arrangement had another barb, which wounded the heart of the Lord in a peculiar manner. And Luke tells us how, in that moment when they had crucified the two thieves with the Lord, the one on His right hand, the other on His left, Jesus turned Himself praying to God, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!'.

In this intercessory prayer, Christ plainly refers to all those who have been concerned in His crucifixion,—not merely the four soldiers who might thoughtlessly, in an obtuse and rough manner, discharge the office of nailing Him to the cross in the more precise sense, but also the worldly powers in whose service they acted—the Jewish hierarchy, the Roman government—nay, humanity itself in its old nature, as represented in this case by the spirit of the Roman and Jewish people. The first word that Christ uttered on the cross was thus an intercession for His enemies. Hence it is manifest that He keeps and approves His doctrine as expressed in that most difficult precept which closes with the words, 'Pray for those which despitefully use you, and persecute you'—keeps it even in the sharpest moment of trial, and even to death. This intercession, moreover, was at the same time the loosing of the power of the death of the cross; a gospel which revealed to humanity that His love was victorious over its hatred, and that thus also His death would tend not to their condemnation, but to their reconciliation; that His blood, which had begun to trickle down from hands and feet, and was reddening the soil of the accursed place of skulls, speaketh better things than the blood of Abel (Heb. xii. 24).

For the word of the intercession is to be taken, first of all, in its most general meaning. The world nails Him on the cross, Christ prays for forgiveness of their guilt. But yet the special circumstances under which He spake these words have to be considered,—namely, that they crucified Him in this form as the King of the Jews, with His imputed companions. Therefore they reckoned Him among malefactors, according to the word of the prophet (Mark xv. 28; comp. Isa. liii. 12). They set Him forth as the prince of malefactors; yea, they suffered Him to appear with the two criminals as the symbolic image of that mysterious kingdom in which the Jews hoped. In the form of the three crucified ones upon Golgotha, the world-spirit sought

to represent the Messiah with His elected ones, Him and the whole kingdom of heaven, as a contemptible mingling of fanaticism and crime. The Jewish hierarchs probably felt something of the burning mockery of their religion which Pilate allowed in this arrangement, but they did not feel that it was they themselves who had impelled him to this exposure. With their darkened spiritual vision, they could only see in the fact an insult to their people, who, nevertheless, were still supposed to be so rich in honour still; while that insult did indeed represent a great mockery of the kingdom of God in its King and in His elect, of which their unbelief was in the greatest measure guilty.

If we have in mind the special relation of the word of Christ, we perceive, moreover, the expression of His kingly consciousness, of His perfect assurance of the kingdom, in the words, 'they know not what they do!' It must not be overlooked that Christ founded His intercession for men on the words, They know not what they do! The world in general was entirely benefited by this intercession; for it knew not effectually, in the dream and slumber of its infinite perplexity, that in this moment it had nailed to the cross the Lord of glory. But it benefited the individuals who were involved in the guilt of the crucifixion, in proportion as they in fact knew not what they did. But none could know it entirely. For how could the sin become wholly clear to itself? But He who knew altogether what they did, set infinite love, eternal grace, over against overwhelming guilt.

Those to whom the intercession most immediately referred—the soldiery, namely, who executed the crucifixion—gave the most evident testimony that they knew not what they did. After they had finished their work they shared among them His clothes, which by Roman right fell to their lot.[1] Of the upper garment they probably made four parts, loosening the *seams*.[2] But the under garment could not thus be unsewn, because it was without seam—worked in one piece—a kind of dress which resembled the priestly garment, as it must have been in use, however, among the poor Galileans generally as well.[3] That

[1] Friedlieb, 149.

[2] John, vers. 23, 24; comp. Sepp, 553. Four soldiers were required, according to the Roman appointment of military service, 'ad excubias.'—Hug, ii. 181.

[3] Friedlieb, 149; Sepp, iii. 552.

they might not spoil this garment by rending it, they drew lots for it. John observes that the scripture was thus fulfilled, 'They parted My raiment among them, and for My vesture they did cast lots' (Ps. xxii. 18). Thus did the soldiers, he adds significantly, as if he would say, Even these rude men from distant lands were placed under the law by which they must co-operate to the fulfilment of Scripture, although naturally they did so with entire unconsciousness. In thus casting lots upon the vesture of Christ, the amusement of the soldiers took the character of a game at dice,—a character which the deeper consideration of the contrasts involved in the history of passion cannot have overlooked. In any case, in the eagerness with which even at the foot of the cross the soldiers participate in the booty, in the haste with which they arrive at the thought of casting lots upon the garment of Christ, they show that they are engaged, even in these circumstances, with great power of roughness and carelessness, in the element of the common worldly life of the soldier.

Thus they sate there (at all events beginning to play), and took charge of their service of watching, in respect of the crucified One, which was appointed to prevent the criminal from being prematurely or illegally taken away.[1]

The friends of Jesus had not, in the meantime, lost sight of Him. They had followed Him from far, at greater or less distance, according as they could, either with a view to external circumstances or to internal dispositions (Luke xxiii. 49). But now, in the first moments in which Christ hung upon the cross, the greatest possibility became manifest to them of approaching Him more nearly. The Jews in multitudes ran back to the city, in vexation at the inscription on the cross; the high priests wrangled with Pilate; the Roman soldiers divided the relics of Christ, and cast lots for His vesture. It was a moment of which true love availed itself. Soon some members of the family of Christ were standing close by the cross, of whom, for instance, John names to us the mother of Jesus, His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas,[2] and Mary Magdalene. We gather from the result, that John himself was also there. Jesus looked upon His mother, and saw standing by her the disciple whom He loved; and now it became plain how infinitely rich He still was,

[1] Friedlieb, 149; Sepp, iii. 553. [2] According to Wieseler, p. 146.

although hanging naked upon the cross; and although the soldiers had just divided His clothes among them. He had nothing earthly to bequeath to His disciples, and what would it have been to them in this moment? He was the source, however, of a nobler legacy. Turning to His mother, He said, 'Woman (trembling, helpless being[1]), behold thy son;' and to His friend, 'Behold thy mother.' It is doubtless of special meaning that Jesus does not name the names; it testifies of the everlasting rule of that sharp-sighted prudence, which, in its indissoluble harmony with the true simplicity of the dove, was comparable even to the wisdom of the serpent; and even in the moment of self-sacrificing heroism did not forget its office and its duty. Although now only individual witnesses were standing under the cross, Jesus might be willing, nevertheless, to avoid naming the names of His people, in order not to betray them to their enemies. What a comforting light-beam of love, strong as heaven, He threw with this double saying into the mournful darkness of His disciples! How spiritually and how holily He knew how to link these two together—two of the most chosen souls whom, after Him, the earth had seen, and who, just for that reason, must suffer, mourn, and be afflicted, more terribly and deeply for Him than any others! And how marvellously He knew how to support them! The desertion of the mother He entirely relieved, by giving her a son. The most comfortless thing to the woman, in her destitution of comfort, is when she loses the accustomed spiritual support, the strong manly firmness to which she was accustomed. Hitherto Mary had been accustomed to lean upon the holy Son, as upon a rock: this support was in some measure supplied to her now (as it could not be supplied to her by her step-sons the sons of Alphæus); it was given to her in the friend of her Son. But what most of all sustains the man for whom life seems to have lost its value, is the sense of a new important duty which binds him to life with new bonds. Such a great duty the Lord gave to the favoured disciple, in committing to him the care of His mother. John and Mary would indeed have remained, even without this arrangement of Jesus, in close spiritual fellowship; but the Lord gave to this fellowship a form by which it became right and duty in the face of the world,—a defined sacred household

[1] See above, vol. ii. p. 293.

tie—the highest, tenderest relation of piety—between mother and son. And thus, likewise, is declared, that in this appointment Christ cared at the same time for the others who stood near,—namely, for Mary Cleophas and Mary Magdalene. To the two other Marys, and to all His friends, He gave a central place in the house that He founded in their midst, and in which, so to speak, His house-fatherhood prolonged itself upon earth. The household of John was from that time to form the ground of union for His elected ones. John understood Him even in this moment. From that hour he took Mary, as his mother, unto his own home. In the spiritual meaning, however, John has remained for all times the central point for the elect and nearest kindreds of the family of Jesus. And in this character He will remain till Jesus comes again (John xxi.).

Thus, little knew the Spirit of the dying Christ of despair; thus little did He become indifferent to the necessity and the equity of life, of need, of friendship, and of love. Down from the cross, on the place of skulls of the old world, He appoints those associations which, as the hearths of faith, of love, and of hope, surrounded by the fragmentary world of unbelief, of hatred, and of wretchedness, point across to the everlasting city of God, which is their home.

But if John tells us that from that hour he considered Mary as his mother, and took her to himself, he gives to us therewith a token of peace out of the night of the disciples, male and female, of Jesus. They thus understood His institution, and acknowledged it, as a security for the continuing prevalence of His love, for the continuing value of life. Although, even in these hours, a sword passed through the mother's soul, yet she still proved, by acquiescing in this appointment of her Son's love, that her soul did not despair, but with His Spirit struggled upwards out of the darkness of this temptation—that she still loved, lived, believed, and hoped. This is true also of John, and all the disciples. Although the manner of their hope might be very various, they did not remain so absolutely destitute of comfort, after such signs of faith, as they are usually represented to be by Catholic poetry and tradition. Yea, even at this moment, when their earthly world and hope was altogether crumbling to pieces, the presentiment of the new world must have unfolded itself in the depth of their soul, at the glimpse

of divine power with which the Crucified died, veiled indeed, at first, in the twilight of unconscious longing and in severe birth-throes. The whole spirit and connection of evangelic history assures us, that even the sons of Alphæus, who in a peculiar degree had hoped for the earthly glory of Jesus, and therefore probably had also been in a peculiar degree shaken, stood in need now of a supporting and comforting centre, such as was given to them and all the disciples in the person of John.

The tide of the enemies of Jesus which for a while had ebbed from Golgotha, to rush angrily back upon the judgment-house on the temple-mountain, soon flowed back again as strongly as ever. As soon as the answer of Pilate was known, the Jews thought they had a reason for venting their rage in aggravated measure against Jesus. They wished now, in spite of the inscription, to manifest very decidedly that they had nothing to do with the crucified One. Thus they stood now close by the place of execution, passed backwards and forwards, and reviled Him, wagging their heads at Him. For the most part, the reviling was coined into the catchword,[1] 'Ha, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it again in three days, save Thyself! Come down from the cross!' Between whiles occurred the expression, 'If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.' Plainly they wished now to bring into prominence as strongly as possible the religious reproach that He is a blasphemer of God, in order to form a counterpoise to the inscription of Pilate. They thought that His claim to be able to build a new temple was contradicted most fatally by the cross. Of an operation by the Spirit through suffering they had thus no presentiment, in spite of the voices of their prophets. They were therein glad to submit to the misinterpretation which the word of Christ about His building of the temple had undergone in the mouth of the false hearers and witnesses. They did not perceive that it was they themselves who were even now putting down the temple of God, and that Jesus decided the speedy rebuilding of it in His present sufferings by His labour in the Spirit. Gradually a second class of mockers associated itself from the people with these

[1] 'Uneducated men frequently choose a catchword, which they constantly repeat, because they do not know how to bring out any connected discourse. Thus here it was the word, The destroyer of the temple,' etc.—Rauschenbusch, 420.

despisers of Jesus, Pharisees and scribes, even high-priestly persons. These could introduce more variety into their mockery, but at the same time they enhanced the bitterness and malice of it. 'He hath saved others, Himself He cannot save.' How gladly would they have made use of the fact that He was now sacrificing His life on the cross, and which they laid hold of in the distorted form that He could not help Himself, in order to blot out the great recollection that He had helped so many others. Nevertheless they did not venture directly to deny this. Still they combined the compulsory acknowledgment in such a manner with the wondering question, Can He not help Himself? that this must needs throw back a doubt even upon that acknowledgment. But their outcry proved that they were wholly unable to conceive of the miraculous power of Christ as the Holy Spirit's power, which was conditioned upon obedience, even to the death upon the cross, but only as a limitless magic of absolutely arbitrary power, of which they fancied that He must needs turn it before all things to His own advantage, if it were generally in any measure at His command. The second word with which they mocked Him is manifestly at the same time a bitter criticism of the inscription over the cross, 'If He be Christ, the King of Israel, let Him now descend from the cross, that we may see it, and believe on Him.' We think we perceive in this cry, again, the dull sound of the inveterate enmity with which the Jews rejected the Lord, because He would not be a Christ in their sense,—an enmity which Pilate had lately roused anew. In minds which were so darkened as these, the superstition might even now be longingly looking askance at the possibility that Jesus might, by a miracle, free Himself from the cross, and destroy the Romans. In their ecclesiastical pride, they fancied that He must still always receive it as a favour if they did homage to Him. This, indeed, is not the first meaning of their words: they mock, and mean to mock. But out of the frivolous mockery is always suggested a serious thought, a fancy, or even an ejaculation. And thus it is here; at all events, the fathers in Israel must have a dim, despairing, and bitter feeling that they have rejected their Messiah, even although this does not come up to the level of consciousness. Thence is explained, also, the form of the third reviling, 'He trusted in God; let Him deliver Him, if He will have Him: for He said, I am the Son of God' (or,

according to Luke, His elected). It is not to be denied but that these words of the reviling of Christ pass over into the blasphemy of God. They must needs acknowledge, however unwillingly, that Jesus trusted in God. If His confidence, then, is confounded, as they assume, the reproach falls back upon God. The word, moreover, has in itself the form of the bitterest ill-feeling against God Himself—of real blasphemy. The critic who wants to make it out improbable that the Jewish hierarchs thus spoke,[1] has never observed apparently how frequently fanaticism, in the moments of rage, when it purposes to be exceedingly zealous for God, involuntarily falls into blasphemy of God.[2]

This time also, according to Luke, the example of the Jews operated contagiously upon the heathen soldiers. They copied their example by beginning likewise to deride the crucified One. They stepped up to Him, offered Him (probably pledging Him, in soldier fashion) their sour soldiers' wine, and required Him, if He was the King of the Jews, to deliver Himself. Luke, in this place, mentions the inscription over the crucified One, an intimation that the soldiers took occasion from its words to mock Him again. It might perhaps be possible, moreover, that they quoted the words in the meaning of Pilate, in order, by the way, to irritate the Jews.

The sound of revilings, however, was to attain its highest point in a still more frightful fact. The malefactors also who were crucified with Him reviled Him, according to the account of the first Evangelists. Luke, on the other hand, relates, with more circumstantiality, that one of the malefactors suspended with Him reviled Him, saying, 'If Thou be the Christ, save Thyself and us.' But that He was rebuked by the other malefactor with the words, 'Dost thou not fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.'

[1] Strauss, ii. 526. It would indeed make the acceptance difficult, of the fact that the members of the Sanhedrim thus blasphemed God, if it were to be supposed that they consciously made use of the words which, in Ps. xxii. 8, were attributed to the enemies of the godly man. But this supposition is in no wise necessary. For the rest, it is just that the same criticism which cannot allow man in good things to transcend the sphere of a school-boy mediocrity, should seek in evil things to maintain him as much as possible in the sphere of security.

[2] For example, in frightful imprecations.

Then turning to Jesus, he said the words, 'Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom!' This distinction is not easily explained. It is not sufficient here to observe, that the two first Evangelists only narrate indefinitely, while Luke gives a more accurate account. The two declare, with sufficient accuracy, that Jesus was reviled by those who were crucified with Him; while Luke, as it were by anticipation, represents a contrast between the hardened and the repentant thief. In the first testimony, it is not to be overlooked that it is furnished by the Evangelists of whom one is an apostle; neither in the second is it to be disregarded, that it bears on itself the characteristic features of truth in a high degree, and entirely belongs to the family of those extraordinary traits of the operation of grace which Luke gathered with so much zeal. Besides, it would contradict the general credibility of that Evangelist, if it were to be supposed that in this place he has taken up an apocryphal narrative instead of a genuine one. Therefore those who conceive that both testimonies must in some measure be received,—namely, that first of all the two thieves were hostile to the Lord, but that subsequently the one became of a changed mind and repented,—appear to be justified in, and indeed compelled to, this assumption by the precision of the evangelic narratives. It is certainly very difficult to figure to one's self such a change; but it is not impossible. How often, in the case of one called by God to repentance, even in the midst of the last temptation to seek peace once again in the way of the old life, does the conscience become fully aroused! Thus, perchance, according to this view, the better of the thieves, in spite of deep movements of heart towards repentance, which occurred in him in spite of the first holy impression which he had received from Jesus, may have allowed himself at first to be carried away once more by the spirit of fellowship to join with his companion in wounding the Lord with unbecoming speech, whom that more evil associate, who probably had hitherto been his master in evil—his evil genius—had set him the example. But even while he was thus, for the last time, striking the old note, he might have become conscious of the falsehood that it contained,—of the contradiction involved, to the better feeling which was working itself upwards from his heart. And it would be no wonder if in this case his last error should have hastened his conversion.

In this behalf it is, moreover, to be remembered, that the two first Evangelists tell us of the two thieves that they reviled Jesus (*ὠνείδιζον*); while in Luke it is said of the wicked thief, that he blasphemed Him (*ἐβλασφήμει αὐτὸν*). This difference is very important, and if carefully considered, may perhaps lead to a solution of the difficulty.

When Jesus was thus scoffed and mocked by the most various persons as He hung on the cross, His fellow-sufferers also began to revile Him, or to utter reproaches to Him.[1] But they abused Him in the most different feeling, in the most different manner; and in the one his heart was soon turned to the repentance from which proceeded the prayer of faith, while the other became the victim of the despairing rage in which he blasphemed the Lord. But how could such a contrast be developed out of the fact, that they had both first of all assailed the crucified One, and wounded Him with reproaches?

These thieves were both of them probably robbers in the manner in which at that time there appeared many in Judea; chiliastic plunderers, probably seditious men, such as Barabbas; perhaps also partakers in the same conspiracy in which he had committed a murder. The fact that the Jews so passionately begged the release of Barabbas, was no doubt suspicious to Pilate, with reason: it testified of the secret sympathy which was felt by the Jews of that time for all actual theocratic demagogues and rebels against the Roman power; and this induced him to have the two seditious men who had remained in prison led to execution immediately. But the disposition and the vices of these rebels seem to have been radically different. Both had revolted for the liberty of the Jews, for the theocratic kingdom, and had become criminals in the fanatical excitement, whereby they wished to bring about that liberty. But the one appears to have devoted himself with an honest, if a darkened and deluded mind, to the freedom and the hope of Israel, while the other had made that idea serviceable to his gloomy passions. In the

[1] The word *ὀνειδίζειν* is of very comprehensive meaning. It has not only the signification to abuse, to revile, but also to make reproaches, blamingly to upbraid anybody with anything, etc. The word *ὄνειδος*, whence it is derived, 'was used originally without question, as *κλέος*, *φήμη*, *ὄνομα*, *fama* and *honos*—as well of good as of evil report;' thus *ονειδιζειν* may mean also to praise—to exalt—to glorify.

former, the thoughts of angry discontent against Jehovah and His coming Anointed, which often strongly affected the better minds in Israel,—as, for instance, they were illustrated in that doubt of the Baptist about the mission of Christ, and in the sword-blow of Peter,—became exaggerated and embodied, till they resulted in a crime against society, and guilt that deserved death; while in the latter, that gloomy, thoroughly sordid, despairing and desperately wicked chiliastic feeling which animated the policy of Caiaphas and the treachery of Judas, had become realized in the form of political crime. In this respect they were both substantially at one, that the failure of their undertaking had filled them with rage. Thus they were led with Jesus to Golgotha. They saw that they were set forth as partakers of one offence with Him. They knew, no doubt, that many among the people had expected that Jesus would redeem Israel; and they perhaps had a dim feeling that He was the man on whom, in some mysterious manner, the destiny of Israel depended. Thus their rage was naturally directed against Him. But thus different was their disposition; thus different was the spirit in which they bore ill-will to Him; and thus contrasted were the results also which these dispositions ensured. In that hour in which the hope of Israel in the kingdom of God was more than ever shaken; in that hour in which Christ Himself, in the perfect sanctity of His feeling, could utter the cry, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? in which a sword passed through the soul of Mary, and in which John the Baptist, in disturbed mood, could have, with repeated emphasis, urged the question, Art Thou He that should come?—in such an hour, it might easily be understood how an erring, misguided man, who had become a criminal by theocratic delusion, and who really had a heart for the freedom and hope of Israel in their higher meaning, should, at his first glance on the crucified Jesus, express the final ebullition of his bitter discontent in a sinful manner, by making reproaches against Him, because He had not proved His spiritual power by the destruction of His enemies and the enemies of His people. He might angrily and abusively, and yet with an honest intention, challenge Him to come down now in triumph from the cross, and turn judgment to victory over His enemies. If he reproached the Lord in this meaning, it was at least a proof that he regarded Him as the Messiah, but

that he had not yet submitted to Him in spirit. He was then, so to speak, a lively representation of all those feelings of anger with which the disciples at first perceived that their Lord was determined to go the way of suffering. But He might now also become a type of all those Jews who turned to Christianity, when they beheld, in the destruction of Jerusalem, their hope of the present manifestation of their people's glory crumble into ruins; nay, a type of the purified Messianic hope of the disciples themselves. And thus it happened. With the last effervescence of his anger his haughty spirit gave way. He broke down in view of the divine patience and assurance with which Christ met death. And now, even the evil spirit of despair, with which his companion in guilt began to blaspheme the Lord, helped to bring him to a decision.

Both the thieves, in their addresses to Christ, prove themselves to be men who had formerly hoped for the Messianic kingdom, and probably had, in the character of chiliasts, made a disturbance for it. But in the case of the hardened one, the worm of despair breaks forth from the heart of his scattered hope; in the case of the repentant one, there rises from the dissolving smoke of a criminal fanaticism the flame of the assurance of the future kingdom of God brightening heavenward. The despairing one cries out in mockery: If Thou art Christ, save Thyself and us. If this present life be not saved—if it is to pass to death through the suffering of the cross,—he cannot believe on the Christ. Only a Christ of this world has any reality for him; with his life here his Christ melts away from him. But the other begins to see with perfect clearness, when he beholds this man, usually, in all probability, so imperious in spirit, now so lamentably despairing. As plants ripen under the tropical sun, thus his repentance and his faith are developed under the twofold influence under which he finds himself in that critical hour, between the heavenly, victorious spirit of Christ, and the hellish despair of his companion. It is certain to him that this Jesus overcomes everything by His patience. Thence also it is certain to him, that in His sufferings He proves Himself to be the Messiah, and that through His sufferings He establishes a kingdom, and that in the glory of this kingdom He will one day come even to the spirits in the kingdom of the dead. And in the light of this acknowledgment he beholds

now the guilt of his companion as well as his own. Thus he rebukes his partner in guilt, he acknowledges his own misdoing, and he entreats Christ for His grace. For all that, there still is left the question why the two first Evangelists have recorded nothing of the repentance of this thief, and Luke nothing of his previous offence. But here once more, it is perhaps to be remembered that several of the notices of Luke bear the stamp of being attributable to the evangelic recollection of the mother of Jesus.[1] This appears to be the case with this communication. Mary must have been standing very near to the cross when this conversation between Jesus and the thief occurred. She thus could know the particulars of his conversion; and if she regarded his first unbecoming expressions with reference to his conversion, she might easily let them slip. On the other hand, the two first Evangelists appear to represent a group of disciples to whom the unfolding of the contrast between the two thieves did not come so immediately into view.

The repentant thief implored the Lord with an expression which was very customary in Israel, especially at departure, 'Remember me! remember me,' he prayed, 'when Thou comest in Thy kingdom.'

But the Lord consoled him with the great promise, 'Verily I say unto thee, This day shalt thou be with Me in paradise.' In this word all is certainty. The confidence in the earnestness of the sorrow of the thief, his pardon, the assurance of eternal life, the promise of his blessed union with Jesus, the speedy fulfilment of all his wishes, the promise of his exaltation into heaven even on that day;—all is introduced and affirmed by the dying Jesus with an oath.

The repentant thief, with the word of his repentance which he uttered, had also done a great deed of repentance. In the hour of death he had set himself free from the strong bands of fellowship which had previously chained him to a daring offender; and had openly acknowledged his sins. And thus the word of his faith in Jesus was a great act of his faith also. He attained to the faith, and confessed the faith in the glory of Jesus in an hour in which, outlawed, condemned, regarded as one among malefactors, apparently forsaken of God as he was forsaken of

[1] See above, vol. i. p. 376.

men, Jesus Himself hung dying on the cross. But the royal majesty with which Jesus received him—with which he welcomed the notorious robber, who had been obtruded upon Him in external fellowship in suffering, to a spiritual fellowship of His present sufferings and of His coming glory,—with which He received him without conditions, without appointment of any intervals of delay;—this was the first manifestation of that boundless glory of grace which first began to operate with His crucifixion. In all points His grant went far beyond the prayer of the poor man. Remember me! he asked. On the other hand, Jesus gave him the assurance that he should live with Him as His companion. He would have been gladly cheered with the expectation of an undefined future. Jesus, on the other hand, says to him that this day his blessedness should begin. He did not hope to be received among the members of the kingdom before the revelation of the kingdom; but Jesus gives him the assurance that He will take him up after his death into paradise —thus into a spiritual kingdom of heaven.[1] Thus limitlessly could His grace, which was just now breaking through the darkness of the world's curse, be revealed to the thief, because the faith of the thief was so great. That penitent owed nothing more to the world—he was free from it by the payment of his life. From his wicked comrade he had become free by his word of admonition. Moreover, from his guilt, as from his old Jewish delusion, the grace made him now free which had disclosed to him the kingdom of patience as the kingdom of the victorious spirit. The beam of certainty of life in the asseveration of Christ made him free from the fear of death; and that spirit of salvation, for whom one day can be as a thousand years, and whose rapid and great effects of salvation he had implored by his rapid and great repentance, set him free from all the conditions of the time of expectation.

The first word of Christ on the cross was a triumph of His love of His enemy in the presence of the enemies who nailed Him there. The second word was a triumph of His love of His friend in the face of a destruction of life which seemed to bid defiance to all bonds of soul. The third word is a triumph of His grace in the face of the final doom itself, with its sanguinary terrors. Since the time that Christ thus on the scene

[1] On the Jewish doctrine of paradise, see Sepp, iii. 557.

of death (upon the place of execution) pardoned the bleeding criminal in the dying hour, while He himself, the true High Priest in the form of the criminal, hung there with pierced hands; —since then, the faith in His heroic form has expanded in the world,—the faith which is often manifest in the repentance of the most degraded malefactors, in the repentance of the dying, —the faith which believes in the possibility of the conversion of great sinners, in the truth of late conversion,—the faith which can see the place of execution change into an entrance-hall to the throne of everlasting grace, into the sanctuary of reconciliation, and which gladly ventures to preach the Gospel even to the poor in the hour of death, in prisons, and on places of execution.

It has been rightly pointed out that the frightful form of that despairing man who died in the midst of blasphemies of the crucified One, whom he beheld by sight, does not permit any misinterpretation of this glory of grace, in the interest of presumptuous frivolity.

In the first period of Christ's passion on the cross, He had enjoyed quiet for a moment, and had been able to take leave of His disciples. Then followed the period when the hatred of men raged at large against Him, for the last time in which the 'procession' of blasphemers passed by Him, the floods of mockery overflowed upon Him. Mockery is at all times the show of spiritual ascendancy, the appearance of victory. The mockery of the wicked is the triumph, the scornful laughter, of the wicked. Thus Jesus allowed to pass over Him now, in every form of mockery, the great scornful laughter of hell, which regarded Him as destroyed. But the appearance of victory melted before the certainty of victory with which He pardoned the thief. Hatred was dumb, and His love kept the last word. Despair was dumb, and His living Spirit preached immortality and meeting again. The judgment, the shame, and the death vanished away as His grace, so to speak, took the thief by the hand to lead him up into the lofty heaven. But now gradually approached the third, the greatest and most mysterious period of His passion.

Already, from the sixth hour, the clearness of day, of the mid-day, began to be obscured. Gradually there spread a darkness over the whole land, increasing in fearful intensity even

till the ninth hour. This darkening of the earth, according to an acknowledged observation, did not proceed from an eclipse of the sun (since such a phenomenon in the days of Easter, at the time of the full moon, could not occur); rather, according to Luke, the darkening of the sun was the last result of the darkening of the earth. Consequently, this darkness must have had its cause in a peculiar derangement of the terrestrial atmosphere. The signs which occurred later give reason to suppose that this darkening of the land was a precursor of a great earthquake.

But the darkness which went forth to heaven was an external image of the condition of soul which the suffering Christ was now undergoing in silence upon the cross. The bodily effects of His suffering on the cross began to be manifested. The external fire-brand of the wounds in the hands, in the feet, on the brow, on the lacerated back, stretched upon the rough beam of the cross, and the internal glow of fever, were wasting His strength. The great disturbances in the peaceful living flow of His pure blood oppressed His head, agonized His heart, and perturbed the transparent mirror of His pure sense of life. In these tortures Jesus hung there quiet, silent, and struggling, under the mourning aspect of heaven, which was darkening more and more. Thus He hung for more than two hours, till nearly three o'clock in the afternoon. At length the dizziness of weakness must declare itself generally,—that condition in which consciousness will begin to reel, to dream, and then perhaps again to start up again among frightful forms of fancy. He saw death always approaching and overshadowing His life; and He tasted it as only the subtle pure life itself could taste death. A flood of unconsciousness would throw itself over that clear consciousness of eternal life,—a dreamy form of nightly horrors over that spirit of eternal clearness,—a sense of groundless failure and decay over that confidence with which, in His innermost heart, He constantly sate in the bosom of the Father. But when death thus came upon Him, He felt how thoroughly one He had become with humanity, in its destiny of death, by His faithful love; it was to Him as if His consciousness would melt into one with the consciousness of suffering, dying humanity,—as if all its feelings of being forsaken of God in death would be crowded together as into a focus in His breast. He felt the death of humanity; humanity came to the perfect feel-

ing of its death in His heart. And now, for the last time, the tempting spirit once more approached Him. With that sympathy of death, he would inspire Him with all the wild phantasms of the gloomy horror of death as felt by His race. He would represent death as a dark divinity, fill His soul with despair, and suggest ravings out of his own spirit. Against this temptation, however, Christ gathered Himself together with the whole force of His being; and as with the wrath of a lion directed against the fear of death, as with the supplication of a child turned to God, He cries out, 'My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?'

This word of Christ may easily be misunderstood more than any, because it is just the last decisive word of His contest in which He wins the victory,—and because, therefore, in it is combined into one the deepest appearance of human despair with the deepest resistance of divine dependence,—nay, because in this word death appears in its last struggle with life as it is entwined with victory. In the apprehension of this we attain before all things the right tone of every individual expression in the Spirit. According to the several partial tones is modified the understanding of the word. It may, indeed, be probably assumed that Christ uttered this cry with conscious remembrance of the words with which the 22d Psalm opens. For as there the sacred singer, in the spirit of Messianic longing, cried upwards to God out of the depth of the Spirit of Christ, so now Christ cries up to God in the spirit of Messianic sympathy out of the depth of the human death-need. But if it is thought that Christ would not thus have uttered these words if He had not by reciting or praying, according to the old Scripture word, wished to strengthen Himself[1] by that Psalm, it is forgotten that every Messianic feeling of the Old Testament must be *realized* in Him,—that Christ did not externally imitate, but in the deepest truth internally accomplished, what was written. If it were otherwise, the mysterious words of Christ would be deprived of all the original freshness and energy of His spiritual utterance. Moreover, if we take the expression, My God, My God, here in the diluted form of a cry become more or less habitual, and if we overlook the emphasis in the questioning

[1] Thus Schleiermacher, *Glaubenslehre*, ii. 154; Neander, 466; and others. Compare, on the other hand, Olshausen, iv. 239; Strauss, ii. 529.

Why? in order the more to lay stress upon the subsequent expression of neglect, we come to the view that the words could contain an outcry of real despair, or even the testimony of a darkening of the consciousness of God in Jesus.[1] But thus is denied the definite emphasis which the outcry, My God, My God, must needs have in the mouth of Christ. In these words it is determined that God remains *His* God, that His consciousness even now is in perfect harmony with God, as if He embraced Him with both arms. The questioning Why? moreover, is the perfectly devout question of the suffering holy child to His Eternal Father, the concentrated expression of all questions which sorrowing humanity addresses to the Unsearchable; the great *wherefore*, which is permitted to the troubled human race, on the administration of God in His infinitely pure glorification. This question of Christ looks back to the guilt of humanity, which must be atoned for; it looks up to the countenance of the Father, in which judgment is transfigured into deliverance; it looks forward to the salvation which proceeds out of this suffering. Because humanity had forsaken God, God appeared to be willing to join with it in forsaking their holy Prince, who would not forsake humanity; but because He would neither forsake God nor forsake humanity, the terror of the desertion of God incurred by the world must be loosed in His soul, and even in the depth of this terror He must find God once more in the glory of His grace on behalf of humanity. But, finally, the words may be weakened in their meaning, if the complaining cry, *Thou* forsaken *Me!* be not apprehended in their full force and depth.[2] The more we yield ourselves up reverentially to the power of this word,—a power derived from all its associations,—the more we feel that it is just at this point that the great apparent contradiction—the deepest desertion of God, and the closest nearness to Him—judgment and reconciliation—consciousness of death and victory over death—is solved; that thus Christ has completed His work with this saying, which is His last and greatest work.

[1] The lattter view is to be found in De Wette on Matt. 238.

[2] As De Wette, p. 239. He indeed contends with reason against the view of Olshausen, according to which, in this suffering of Jesus, His physical tortures must have been combined with a divesting of His soul of divine power.

If it were to be asked, how could His bodily experience on the cross depress Him again once more into this depth of misery, after He in His Spirit (John xiii. 32) and in His soul (in Gethsemane) had already overcome the world, it is to be considered that in Christ the Word became flesh; and that for that very reason the everlasting Word in Him must suffer in the death-pangs of His corporeity; or, in other words, that His suffering of death was just the completion of all His other suffering—in the same way as His corporeity was the completion of His incarnation. In His death on the cross He underwent the whole death-pang of humanity, in a completeness that in the Spirit *alone* He could not have undergone it. In this passion, His spirit- and soul-life must thus also undergo a new depth of human wretchedness, which it had not yet experienced; and yet the struggles that He had passed through before were not repeated in this passion. At the Passover He endured the final contest with the worldly mind of the fallen world; in Gethsemane, with its sorrow and its aversion. Here upon Golgotha He went through the contest with death itself; and, indeed, He went through it in the unity of His nature, so that spirit, soul, and body were working together here also in one power. For how could His corporeity have suffered without a soul; and, destitute of spirit, how could His bodily suffering have become *His*, since His body was the manifestation, the organ, and the highest and closest expression of His soul- and spirit-life? But it is thought that in the unity of His contest might still be perceived the various manifestations of the several powers of His nature; while the Spirit of Christ addresses to the Father, as a *simple child-like* question, the significant *Why?* He opposes it as a thing *infinitely foreign*,—to death in its human deformity, (in the aspect which he presents to Him as the king of terrors). While the *soul of Christ*, with deepest reality, takes refuge in God with its twofold appeal to Him, it declares, at the same time, the horror with which the frightful form of death fills it; and while He complains of His bodily feeling of death to His God, as the last and deepest suffering of His life, He intimates, at the same time, that death in itself is the manifestation of the desertion of God.

But these several points of the complaint of Jesus must pre-eminently be recognised in their unity. This unity consists in

His uttering before His Father the confession, that in the feeling of His death He is experiencing a sense of His desertion; but in His declaration, at the same time, of His assurance, that He nevertheless abides, under this wonderful appearance of desertion, indissolubly united with Him.

And therein consists the victory of Christ over death, that He acknowledges it as the appearance of the desertion of God, and names it by its right name; that He saw in this desertion an inscrutable arrangement and judgment of His God; and that, nevertheless, in this judgment, He found His God, acknowledged and held Him fast as *His God*, in the deepest and most special sense.

And thus, before His consciousness, the threatening form of death is dissolved in the form of the desertion of God: this desertion is lost in the form of inscrutable arrangement, and the gloomy decree is finally lost in the certainty of the presence of His God. All terrible forms disappear from His eyes before the form of light, into whose arms He has thrown Himself, with the appeal, My God! My God!

In God's judgment He has hailed God as the deliverer. It is manifest, from His whole feeling of His life and of His work as Redeemer, that He thus appealed to God in the name of humanity. It is manifest, also, from the significant, simple, child-like question Why? The answer of God to this question lies in the assurance which thenceforward He attained, that the salvation of the world was accomplished.

How could it be doubted that, in dying as Christ died, in dying with Christ's consciousness, He had experienced death in its deepest human depth—that He thus tasted death by God's grace for all? But if He has experienced the death of humanity in His death, so also He has experienced the desertion of God, which humanity is conscious of in a thousand troubled and confused perceptions. He has acknowledged in His Spirit-bodily life, in a perfectly defined feeling of the effect of this desertion, that this desertion is the spiritual essence of death. And if He has considered this suffering as an act of God, He has pointed to it as the judgment which He endures in Himself, because He endures the death of humanity in Himself; whose form, however, is changed in His consciousness into the announcement of His God—thus even into deliverance itself.

Thus this word of Christ is His greatest deed. But the act of Christ corresponds to the act of God. That moment in which, as the Lion of Judah, He cries out to His Father against the threatening and terrible form of death (as it seeks to appear to Him, in His sympathy with humanity, as an independent power in the appearance of a gloomy divinity, and so to tempt Him to despair), and throws Himself, nevertheless, on the heart of the Father, through the real terrors of death, of the desertion of God, of the world, and the world's judgment,—that is the point at which the Father, as in a holy exultation, draws Him up to His heart, as His thoroughly approved, well-authenticated child, as the truly discovered Priest-King of humanity. The cry of Christ, My God! My God! expresses the presentiment that just at this time God appears out of His retirement—that the Sun of Grace shines forth from the clouds of judgment.

If the question be suggested, How could Christ have felt Himself forsaken of God, since He was still the Son of God?[1] it is the same as is expressed in other words, How did He undergo the feeling of death? how could He die? And this latter form of the question is not the easier, but the more difficult form. For the appearance of God's desertion is just the first spiritual name—the first explanation of the dark riddle which we call death. Certainly, even this first explanation of death has still its obscurity; this is plain from the great *Why?* of Christ. The fuller explanation of death consists in the fact that this desertion is an arrangement of God—a judgment upon the world, which is changed through Christ's consciousness into nearness to God, sense of God, and reconciliation. The Adamic view of the world is indeed of a totally opposite disposition. It is confessed in the gloomy error, that the judgment is explained by removing the agency of God far away from it; that God's desertion is explained by conceiving of it only as death and the feeling of death; and death is explained by putting it back into the gloom of absolute natural necessity. Thus generally it is minded to regard punishment as being explained in its apprehension entirely as evil; or rather, we should say, it will not apprehend it, because it will leave it as an absolutely dark thing of nature, as a fatality, to the decision of fate. On the other hand, evil is enveloped in gloom, if it is considered as the will of

[1] Strauss, ii. 529.

God; but especially if it is considered as punishment. Christianity, indeed, loses sight of the conception of punishment in the kingdom of grace; but here it is not condemned into the not understood form of evil, but it glorifies itself into the chastising arrangement of delivering grace.

The most difficult question thus remains, How can the Son of God have suffered death? And in the most difficult view, this is its purport. How is the fact that Christ died, to be reconciled with the doctrine of His Godhead? First of all, the great misunderstanding must be got rid of, which encourages the notion that the conditioned is the limited,—that that which is determined is a matter of fate, a matter removed from God's control. The Son of God represents the nature of God, just in His self-determination, in His self-conditioning. And in His human manifestation He advances from conditional to conditional, even to the death on the cross. But exactly the point at which conditionality threatens to become the annihilation of His being, is the point at which all His conditionality is perfected in God as self-conditioning. He dies with the perfect consciousness that He dies in His God; and therewith He abolishes the old significance of death, according to which it had terrified humanity, as if it were another gloomy God. He has the power to lay down His life, and He uses it; therefore also He has the power to take His life again. He can allow His sense of life to melt away in God's ordinance, therefore He can attain it again in the depth of the divinity. And as He glorifies all finiteness by His finiteness, all conditionality through His conditionality (He being the most contemned and unworthy of all), so also He explains the darkest depth of all human conditionalities—death. He changes it into a mysterious point of new formation of His life in God. In Him also the consciousness of the divinity itself comes in contact with the consciousness of death. The heart of God feels the breath of death in the dying heart which forms the centre of humanity, but absolutely for that reason death dies in the heart of God. The eternal God, who in the mission of death makes known the lofty supremacy of His administration over the creature, expresses in the death of His Son the sympathy of His nature with the death of humanity. But when the death of the Son of God is changed immediately into the victory over death, there is revealed therein the truth

that death is only a special appointment in the administration of God, only a special angel among the spirits of His revelation, —that its apparent independence constantly melts away in its omnipresence, the death of the mere creature in His new creating breath of life, the death of the sinner in His punitive righteousness, the death of the faithful in His grace, the death of the only beloved Son in His present divinity itself.

Thus, then, the answer to the question is anticipated, How could the Son of God feel Himself forsaken of God? The question is, first of all, How could He give this name to the sense of death—the sense of God's desertion? Here we must observe, before all, that for Him the feeling and the consciousness of life was absolutely one with the feeling and the consciousness of *the presence* of God. When thus the presentiment of death came over Him as a convulsion of His life, as a darkening of His consciousness, when the dizziness of weakness veiled His spirit, we understand that His consciousness of God was disturbed in the same measure that His consciousness of life wavered. Here occurred the moment when the sphere of His conditionality on the part of God threatened to shrink even to the annihilation of His consciousness; therefore this form of His conditionality must have appeared to Him as an expression of the desertion of God. Added to this, He experienced in Himself, in His feeling of death by the sympathy of His Spirit, the world's sense of death, and was tempted by the unbounded despair in this sense of death. In a moment in which His self-consciousness wavered, that dark feeling of death in its giant-might threatened to surprise Him in His weakness, and to obscure His consciousness of God. The abyss of all the God-desertion of the world yawned before His failing sense of life. Hence He both could and must characterize His position as a *feeling of apparent desertion of God.* But just as in the divine knowledge of His death He overcame death, He overcame, in the consciousness of God contained in His Spirit, that appearance of desertion of God in His feeling. In the enduring clearness of His God-consciousness, He did away with the gloom in the suffering of His own consciousness. Moreover, if we refer this experience of Christ specially to His divinity, there will indeed arise the deepest contradiction in the assertion that God saw Himself forsaken of God. But that great mystery

does not occur in this formula, since it cannot once be said that the Son of God saw Himself forsaken by the Father. *He felt the desertion of God*, but He did away with this feeling in *the God-consciousness of His Spirit*. And thus in His death-pang that contrast was manifested which pervades the whole world,—the contrast according to which God is present not only in doing, but also in suffering; not only in the terrors that the world excites, but also in the fears that the world suffers; not only in man's deep sense of life, but also in his dread of death; not only in the revealings, but also in the hidings, of His glory. And it actually constitutes the significance of that cry of Christ's, that it represents this contrast in its deepest power, in the crisis of its world-historical variance, in which it seems to become an absolute contradiction, but only to disclose its everlasting harmony. Here, where the trembling of feeling of God-desertion is combined with the loud appeal of God-assurance in the dying heart of Christ, and where the former is dissolved into the latter,—here it is plain that God has adopted into His consciousness not less the dying pains of all the world than the ordinances of death upon all the world, and that in His Spirit they are explained everlastingly as ordinances for the salvation of the world.

It is manifest that we may not rest in the explanation of this feeling of Christ as being a feeling of God-desertion, as we have said, from the question itself that Christ utters, *Why* hast Thou forsaken Me? We cannot for a moment conceive that Christ in this word intended to reproach the Father, or that He meant to complain with displeasure of the suffering appointed for Him. But the question cannot be only a formula; just as little, finally, can it be a question of perplexity or of suspicion, as though He had not known at all wherefore this desertion of God came upon Him. But what in His spiritual consciousness He well knew already, He craved to know now also in the feeling of His life. He asks the Father out of His own heart, and this heart expects and obtains the answer which makes itself manifest in the great peace of His death. But for our knowledge He has already answered this question in His wandering upon earth; for example, in the words, This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins (Matt. xxvi. 28). For the sake of humanity, therefore, He felt Himself forsaken of God. He thus underwent the judg-

ment of God which, in the gloomy God-desertion of the world, makes itself known (especially also in the fact that it crucified Him) in His suffering of death.

But not in His consciousness as punishment, not for His heart as judgment. The elder theology, when it ventured upon this assertion, made a way for the attacks and mistakes which it subsequently incurred on this point. As closely as it accords with the nature of Christ's consciousness that He must experience in His sympathy with the world the doom of the world, so closely likewise does it accord with that nature that in His experience this doom should brighten into deliverance; that the form of punishment should change to Him into the form of salvation. In the suffering of the Son of God, it must be plain that God does not as an enemy persecute man, in chastising him—in allowing His judgments to pass upon him, as the conscience-stricken man is always ready to fancy. And thus in the suffering of Christ there was given to man the sign and seal of reconciliation with God.

Those, therefore, who would separate the judgment of God upon the world from the suffering of death that Christ sustained, would also, without perceiving it, deprive that suffering of God's light and salvation, and darken the newly beaming day of grace, in which the old terrors, death, despair, the sense of God's desertion, and all the darkness of punishment, are softened and changed into certainties of chastisement, into angels of salvation. They must, moreover, suppose that Christ's question, as a question, had no meaning, and that the Inscrutable had never answered that Why? even to this day.

We must acknowledge it as a mystery, that in a sinner's awakened consciousness of guilt it is one and the same conscience which represents itself at once as God's punishing angel and as a poor trembling sinner,—that it thus appears to divide itself into a hostile opposition, and nevertheless in the unity of his being is more effectual than ever. And thus also we know that the true human judge may grow pale and tremble in the power of sympathy with the human malefactor, whom he must condemn, as if he himself felt his guilt in his own heart, although at the same time he represents with judicial severity the sacred justice which judges the sinner. And was not Christ in His human feeling to be conscious of the judgment of the world at

the moment when God had given up the world into that doom of its blindesss that it nailed Him on the cross? But just as the human judge beholds, in the punishment which he tremblingly decrees for the ill-doer, a justice and a benevolence of God, so Christ in His unity with God knows that the grace of God to humanity will reveal itself in that judgment whose consciousness only He possesses. And therefore He may well implore for His heart this unveiling of God's grace with the question Why? and express in the question itself the confidence that God will answer Him. Thus, as God is everywhere present in the awakened conscience of the sinner, and not only in His terrors, but also in the suffering of his repentance; as He is present in the punitive severity of the judge, as well as in His trembling sympathy, so in His highest glory He is present in the sacred consciousness of Christ, that now the judgment upon the world is come to pass—present in His anguish as well as in His triumph. And this consciousness of Christ informs us of the consciousness wherewith God, in the sacred darkness of His righteous administration, fulfils through all the world His inscrutable judgments, in that all their deadly and painful effects are known to His sympathy, while His grace changes these terrors into salvation.

If we thus fairly present to ourselves that the soul of Christ could express itself in no higher strain than in that exclamation to God, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? and that this question of Christ certainly met a substantial answer from God which was in proportion to itself, we have this acknowledged, that with this appeal of Christ the work of salvation was also substantially decided as a victory over death.

But because this word of Christ expresses the moment in which judgment is accomplished in victory, while the feeling of the world's judgment flashes through Him, and this feeling through His faithfulness to God is changed into the assurance of the world's redemption; thus also the earthly mind, as it is still disposed to despair, may think it perceives even here the most terrible cry of despair, although the saying is always more and more revealing itself to faith as the watchword of Christ's victory over death.

Thus, under the cross of Christ itself, Christ's appeal was even at that time perceived by the disciples, although only

dimly in its divine power. Even to its original expression it stamped itself indelibly on their minds.[1] By others, on the contrary, the same word, even on the spot, was most wickedly misinterpreted. Some of the people who stood under the cross remarked at the same time, 'Behold, He calleth Elias!' These must have been people who were in some degree familiar with the Jewish theology. They knew that Elias was to return as Christ's forerunner, and to prepare a way for Him.[2] They alluded to that, in observing, mockingly, that Jesus called for Elias. But even in this hateful disfigurement of His word, the involuntary acknowledgment is expressed, that His cry to God was filled with an energy of soul, a freshness of life, which astonished the hearers; a prayerful cry as clear and strong as if He had called some one at hand to help,—notwithstanding in this interpretation we have a proof that Christ was crucified by His enemies, not only in His personal manifestation, but also in His individual sayings. That exegesis was a type of the thousandfold twisting of His word out of the infinite into the finite, out of the wonderful into the unusual, out of the Christian into the heathenish, which it was to experience even down to the latest days.

Whilst in the meanwhile the spectators were still busied with this saying, they heard a new cry of Jesus—the word, 'I thirst.'

This saying probably intimates no new access of His suffering. Rather it is a proof that the evening-time had begun to appear in His soul. Hitherto the tension of His spiritual conflict had not suffered Him to think of the ardent thirst which consumed Him. But with His last, hottest struggle, He won the victory. God must have answered Him in His soul, otherwise He could not even now again have thought specially upon His bodily need, and on its satisfaction.[3] John also suggests

[1] In the most exact manner in Mark, in the Aramæan dialect, Eloi, Eloi, etc. Here probably it is to be remembered, that in his great death-struggle, as in his conscious circumstances, a man frequently speaks most accurately his original dialect.

[2] Generally Elias was among the Jews a patron of the distressed. Comp. Sepp, 566.

[3] Thus also the consciousness of hunger on the part of Jesus in the forty days' temptation in the desert, was restrained until towards its conclusion; and also the Lord still did not think of the satisfaction of His hunger so long as the tempter appealed to that necessity, and generally was before Him.

this. He writes, 'When Jesus knew that all things were now accomplished (that the Scripture might be fulfilled[1]), He said, I thirst! It is plain, as the undistorted meaning of the Evangelist, that He does not mean to say that Jesus spoke this word with a purpose only of fulfilling the Scripture. If we assume the contrary,[2] we must suppose that, according to the view of the Evangelists, He did not really thirst, and that He did not care in the most exact sense, therefore, to receive a draught. Moreover, it is forgotten that the same John, a little before, and altogether in a similar manner, says, that the soldiers would not rend the garment of Christ, that the Scripture might be fulfilled—to wit, the passage of the Psalms quoted. In that place (xix. 24) it is certainly not to be thought of that the soldiers would have cast lots about the vesture of Christ for *the sake of the fulfilment* of the Scripture, of which they knew nothing. In that case, therefore, the Evangelist referred the act of the soldiers, in the most significant manner, to the ruling of Providence which led them, so that they unconsciously were compelled to fulfil the Scripture. And was he here, on the contrary, in the most spiritless manner to relate an entirely cognate fact? Certainly the Evangelist might, with entire confidence, assume that Jesus, in this saying also—I thirst—thought on the prophetic element of that description of the fearful thirst in the 22d Psalm, as He generally referred in His sufferings to the prophetic tone of that psalm.

If we have rightly apprehended the previous word of Christ, in which He complains to the Father of His desertion, the word 'I thirst' looks like the word of a hero who had not been conscious that his wounds were bleeding, and that He needed strengthening, until the rage of the battle had ceased; of a hero who begins, in the feeling of his victory, to think upon his own refreshment, and now requests a draught from those who stand around. Thus Christ, in the presentiment of His death, asks for one more draught, for refreshment, after He has already struggled through the great contest with death. And so also this word is to us, first of all, a great and auspicious sign.

Moreover, in that case, the same word is to us a faithful

[1] Comp. Luke xxii. 37, 38.

[2] As Strauss is quite inclined to do (ii. 517), with the timid expression, 'Thus He appears almost to wish to say.'

representation of His position. The Man with the gushing spring of everlasting life in His heart, who formerly spoke the word to the Samaritan woman, Whoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst again, here makes the acknowledgment, I thirst. This word has exactly the same special emphasis with which it is related of Him that He was hungry after He had fasted in the wilderness for forty days. There He was overtaken by hunger in its gigantic power, here by thirst. Even in the endurance of hunger and thirst, He is the fellow-sufferer with humanity, and has become its Prince, its Comforter, and Deliverer. It was to Him now as if all the freshness and fulness of His life were dried up, so wasted was His strength, so withered His life, so breathed through by the fever-glow of His suffering: His whole nature cried out for a last refreshment.[1] And yet even now He was the miraculous spring from which streams forth unfailingly the water of everlasting life, from which it streams even forth in the complaint itself—I thirst!

There is a thirst of the soul which only God can appease—the need of the eternal refreshment of that everlasting creation of God out of the fulness of His eternal life. In this respect Christ could never suffer the wasting thirst; rather He was Himself, in His unity with God, constantly the living spring. Even in the feeling of His desertion itself, it was only for a moment that the terrors of that thirst, of that want of the world separated from God, filled Him with dismay. But there is also a thirst of life which, according to God's ordinance, can only be satisfied by nature, by life, and the love of men. The life planted in the world must be refreshed also in the currents of the actual life of the world. And this thirst Jesus must have actually experienced in the most susceptible manner when He was placed and appointed in the midst of the world as the absolutely sound man, to be refreshed by the whole creation, to be gladdened by the blessings of the entire humanity. Thus He experienced more than any what it means to thirst—to be in want of the refreshing freshness of nature, the comforting hand and love of humanity. But that He expressed this experience in one single complaining cry, is to us a direct proof that His

[1] On the torment of thirst in the crucified, see Sepp, 560.

soul altogether depended on God, and was anew refreshed with His divine fulness. For with this saying He turned again to humanity.

He might now with one last effort have been able easily to overcome His thirst, if He had cared to be able to do so—to seal the bravery of His life with an action of proud stoicism But such apparent heroisms belong to the pre-Christian standpoint. The Founder of a religion which preaches the resurrection of the body, even in His complaint, I thirst, asserted the claim of corporeity, the claim of One parched with thirst, especially of One thirsting in the hour of death; yea, not only the claim, but also the duty of the thirsty One, to seek for Himself refreshment in the ordinance of the sacred life which God has appointed for His life. Thus also He separates His case from all false super-humanity of human pride, whether it be characterized as stoicism, as monachism, or as spiritual abuse of that which is corporeal.

Doubtless it was not permitted to the friends of Christ to hand Him one more refreshing draught. Nevertheless, Jesus uttered His complaint. In the midst of the company of His rude guards—of His stern enemies—He let fall the word, and in so doing has been found the greatest triumph of His love; and rightly. Neither pride nor rancour, nor even mistrust, seals His mouth in this company; not pride;—not even now, when the great feeling is coming on Him, that He has accomplished the deliverance of the world. The first word which He utters in this perfect consciousness, that He henceforward is the King on the throne of grace, is a prayerful complaint, like the word of a beggar. And, moreover, no rancour restrains Him, although these men would already have given Him to drink in scorn and mockery, and are representatives of a world which has given Him to drink, at His departure, of gall and vinegar. Even the simple but difficult tension wherewith for a long time He *must have restrained Himself in silence* towards these men, is past now. He not only can, but He must even now show them again the entire divine impartiality of His love—show it in the form of so humiliating a complaint; yea, He will, and must: it is a necessity to Him, for the breath of God's reconciliation blows around Him, the Spirit of peace begins to brighten the dark world anew for Him; and in this mood it becomes even a necessity for Him

to give to men one more final sign of love, to receive one more token of love from them. As thus He thirsts for the refreshment of the draught, so He thirsts for the draught of refreshing love; thus also for one last human greeting, for a human blessing. And if this feature of His thirst be prosecuted even to its deepest meaning, it may perhaps be said, that here is an entirely peculiar degree of feeling—He thirsted after the souls of men. But it must always appear to us especially remarkable in the word of Jesus, that no mistrust restrained Him from confiding His necessity to the bystanders. After all the experiences which He had had of the power of evil in the human heart, He had nevertheless preserved His confidence in the return of the Spirit of love. And how should He not, when He had just rescued the dying love of humanity in His heart? Even now He began to awaken it in the hearts again of them that stood around, and no word could be more appropriate for that purpose than the word of His faithful prayer.

And the word of Christ produced an instantaneous effect. Close by stood a vessel filled with the common wine frequently alluded to; immediately one of them sprang to it, filled a sponge, fastened it to a reed (of the hyssop plant[1]), and came and gave Him to drink. According to John, several were concerned in doing this; but it is strange that in Matthew's account the rest at this moment cried out, 'Stop! (ἄφες) let us see whether Elias will come to save Him;' whilst in Mark the man who offered Him the draught said these words, as crying to the others to stop (ἄφετε). According to Mark, it is plain that the cry could not have been intended to withhold the draught. It might be supposed that this action indicated the separation of two worlds. In the words of this people there is still perceived a faint echo of the previous mockery; but in their deed is manifest already the power of Christ's Spirit, which constrained them into the service of love. But apparently, even in this latter expression itself, the mocking spirit was much subdued. The heaven above them had become more and more gloomy. The impression made on them by this marvellous darkness, by the dying Christ, by the unprecedented excitement of feeling of the whole people, had become more and more powerful. Finally, the piercing cry of Christ filled them with a dismay never known

[1] Upon this plant, compare Sepp, 563.

before.[1] Thus probably a disposition had come over them, in which they would consider it probable that Elias, as the prophet of retributive punishment, might actually break forth out of the invisible world (comp. Luke xxiii. 48). A great terror of spirit would seize them in spite of the military watch which was present, in spite of the publicity of the place and the multitude of spectators. Already, even at the moment in which Jesus cried out the words, 'Eli, Eli,' the spirit of fear must have influenced them, in order to lead them to that marvellous idea, 'He calleth for Elias.' They put this idea, it is true, into the form of mockery; but probably only to enable them to resist their fear. But the thought does not leave them; and when they now cry to one another, 'Hold, let us see whether Elias will come and help Him,' it is as if we heard a crowd of frightened men, who seek to rid themselves in a dark forest from the fear of spirits, and so cry to one another, as if for a jest, the name of the dreaded being. They *appear* to joke; but if we listen more closely, we observe how they tremble; and it was probably this disposition especially, in which the man who handed to the Lord the last draught said these words. He could only approach Him with fear

Jesus accepted the last poor refreshment which the man offered Him. He drank the sour wine; the draught of honour which was administered to Him at the completion of His work. How often with such wine, sour as vinegar, has the world again and again given Him to drink, in like manner, in His misunderstood struggling, bleeding, dying witnesses!

'And now, with His last strength, He took leave of His friends, as He cried to them, 'It is finished.' *Finished* was His holy life; with His life, His struggle; with His struggle, His work; with His work, the redemption; with the redemption, the foundation of the new world. And therewith substantially, in the sight of God, in His eternity, in the depth of life of the world and of the believing heart, all was finished. With this triumphant cry He confirmed the Gospel to His disciples—the

[1] Olshausen has denied the jesting tone in the words; but, on the other hand, he rightly refers to the mysterious awe which came over their spirits. Strauss thinks, indeed, that this awe and trembling belongs rather to the unscientific disposition of the biblical commentator (531). According to him, it would not be scientific to observe the slighter expressions of a reasonable awe in the presence of the cross.

Gospel which He had announced to them, and had bestowed on the world. In this word He once more comprised all that He had said to them in the high-priestly prayer. At that time all had been finished in His Spirit, but now also all is finished in the destiny of His life. This word was His last to men. John kept it in His heart, and delivered it to the Church as the great word of His farewell to humanity.

But then Jesus turned to His Father, crying with a loud voice, 'Father, into Thine hands I commend My Spirit!'

No shadowy form of a dark destiny stands before Him at the end of His career, although He must die on the cross; the countenance of the Father shines before Him. He does not behold His life melting away into the gloomy floods of mortality. He commends it into the hands of His Father. It is not alone in the general spirit of humanity that He will continue to live. He will live on in the definite personality of His own Spirit, embraced by the special protection and faithfulness of His Father. Thus He does not surrender His life despondingly to death for destruction, but with triumphant consciousness to the Father for resurrection. It was the very centre of His testament: assurance of life; surrender of His life into the hand of a living Father. With loud voice He exclaimed it to the world, which will for ever and ever sink into the heathenish consciousness of death, of the fear of death, of despair of immortality and resurrection, because it for ever and ever allows the consciousness of the personality of God, and of personal union with Him, to be obscured and shaken. With the heart of a lion, the dying Christ once more testified of life with an expression which was connected with the word of the Old Testament Psalm (Ps. xxxi. 5), and testified that the Spirit of eternal life was already operative in prophetic anticipation in the old covenant. Thus living as ever, He surrendered His life, through death, to the eternally living One. His death was the last and highest fact, the crown of His holy life.

The Evangelist Luke probably is indebted for the remembrance of this last word of Jesus to a witness who, at the death of Jesus, stood beneath His cross, probably as in the case of many other remembrances,—to the mother of Jesus. Disciples standing farther away had been, for the most part, startled by the penetrating awakening tone of this last word of Christ.

This indelible impression stamped itself on the two first Gospels. They only relate that Jesus, with a loud cry, gave up the ghost.[1]

At the moment when Jesus, with a loud voice, surrendered His Spirit to the Father, there ensued a great earthquake, which rent the rocks. Probably the darkening of the face of the earth, which had already lasted three hours, had now reached its crisis. It had been the premonitory symptom of the earthquake. This earthquake was its accomplishment. The history of the world is full of suggestions that the evolution of the earth's destiny runs parallel with the history of humanity; and therefore great earthquakes and other natural phenomena have been referred to the death of great men. But that the death of Christ was actually attended by a great earthquake, is entirely in accordance with that mysterious connection between the royal centre of this world and its external cosmical circumference. The earthly world feels that its King dies—that His death lays the foundation for its destruction and for its glorification. It feels a birth-pang of development, through which it progresses into a new stage of its dark life, as is accordant with this revolution of humanity which has now begun.[2]

These appearances in nature, however, become to us at once symbols of the effect of the death of Jesus in the moral world—of His influence upon the hearts of men. This influence showed itself first of all in the most remarkable manner in the case of the Roman centurion who stood beneath the cross, and had the charge of the execution.

It is a circumstance of indescribably beautiful spiritual truth which the Evangelists narrate, that the heathen captain actually, by the startling power in the last cry of Christ, arrived at an assured conviction of His glory. The Roman warrior thought, perhaps, that he had long known what it was to die. And probably he knew, in fact, what honourable death was, according to the principles of Roman bravery—he might have become familiar with it upon many a field of slaughter. But the majesty of voluntary death, which made itself known in the

[1] 'Jesus must' (Strauss, 531), 'according to Matthew and Mark, merely have cried aloud; but according to Luke, He must have cried aloud the words, Πάτερ, etc. As though He must not, according to Matthew and Mark, have cried *something* aloud, if He cried aloud at all.'—Ebrard.

[2] See above, p. 119. Compare Rom. viii. 18.

thunder of the power with which Jesus committed His soul to God—this was new to him, and took possession of his soul, as a revelation of the eternal Godhead. This divine death awakened him to a new life. As if beside himself for excitement, the man began to speak wonderful words. He praised God on account of this event; and it was the least thing, that he praised Him as a righteous man, whom he was commissioned to put to death as a malefactor (Luke, ver. 47). He asserted with an oath, that Jesus is the Son of God. He did not, perhaps, assert this in the sense of a developed Christian acknowledgment; but neither did he assert it in the spirit of heathen superstition. Doubtless the centurion knew of the reproach under which the Jews had brought Christ to the cross,—namely, that He had made Himself the Son of God. This was what he now confirmed by oath, the assertion of Christ about Himself, although he only knew very dimly how to develop to himself its meaning. That this was the reference of his word, Matthew gives us certainly to infer: 'Yea, in truth, this was the Son of God.' As if he had meant to say, It was in truth as He said; and He was not a blasphemer of God, as His enemies wished to stamp Him. The earthquake especially led him to this certainty, with the signs by which it was accompanied. He saw in it a testimony of God. Even his companions were possessed by this spirit. Full of fear, they agreed in his testimony.

Thus this believing heathen, with his companions upon Golgotha, became the first representative of the heathen world, which in after times bowed the knee before the might of Christ's cross. Yea, this witness of Christ, with his assertion that Christ was verily the Son of God, seems already to deliver to the Jews a sentence of punishment for their rejection of Him as a blasphemer of God. But the Jewish people began to quake under the great signs of God which testified for the honour of Christ: many a conscience awoke—many people were moved—a sense of fearful foreboding ran through the crowds, noisily cursing and triumphing. They had come in a crowd diabolically stirred up to crucify the Lord; silently, dejected, one by one, they stole away from Golgotha. Many smote on their breast.[1]

And thus, finally, the opponents left the field to the disciples of Christ. The acquaintances of Jesus—who had stood afar off

[1] The critic Strauss will not understand this, 545

in order to look towards Him always as if they had been chained to the place, especially the pious women who had joined themselves, for the sake of service, to His procession from Galilee, and among whom especially Mary Magdalene, the Mary of Cleophas, and Salome, are named to us—were the last upon the sacred spot. They did not lose the dying One from their view; and the signs also by which God glorified His Only-begotten in death were not lost for them. But the more these signs began to appear, and the more the adversaries began fearfully to retreat, so much the more courageously they could advance. Probably they were even there as ear-witnesses, when the Roman centurion asserted the righteousness and glory of Christ. And when Jesus had died, they might advance as His heirs.

The bequest of His last words had been already communicated to them. As, after the deluge, the seven-coloured rainbow arched itself in the clouds over the earth and announced to the family of Noah the return of the delivering sun; as it was made to him a sacrament of the covenant that God would not henceforth destroy humanity with water, so the seven last words shone forth to their shattered hearts as the spiritual rainbow of grace. Doubtless they were afflicted even to death. The death of Christ had buried their old world in its waves, as formerly Noah saw the old world buried in the waves. But as the sign of the covenant of the seven colours of the celestial light comforted him, so the sign of the covenant of the seven heavenly words comforted them. They could not take leave of Golgotha comfortless when this heavenly sign shone to them. Although even now they still felt it to be gloomy, yet they had received the consolation that they should attain a new life out of this flood of death, into which in spirit they had been plunged down with the Lord, so that to them a fairer world than the new world of Noah must emerge out of this deluge. And as they were the inheritors of the last words of Jesus, they now hoped with stimulated courage to become also the heirs of His corpse.

Moreover, the death of Christ manifested its effect in other ways—in events which of themselves indeed were of a dark and enigmatical kind, but in connection with the leading occurrence became the liveliest symbols. The Evangelist Matthew has preserved the reference to these features, and has recorded them in words which in fact have the ring of a hymn, without at the

same time losing their historical character. For here the history itself takes the character of a hymn. The earthquake, under the sign of which Jesus died, had not only been announced by the darkening of heaven, but also by a peculiar occurrence in the temple. Just as, in the general way, the actual appearance of a convulsion of the earth is known at first by objects in the dwellings beginning to shake, by houses cracking, bells in the towers ringing, or dwellings bursting into flames, so in this case the earthquake especially announced itself by the veil of the temple (which separated the holy place from the holiest of all) being rent in twain from the top to the bottom.[1]

The details of the rending of the veil were of secondary importance to the Evangelist. And although he has not declared himself on the symbolic significance of this event, yet probably it was this significance which induced him to record it. It is true that the moment of the death of Jesus was not primarily the crisis at which the temple was forsaken of its Divinity. Rather the temple had become a desolation when, on account of the unbelief of His people, Christ had been compelled to take leave of it.[2] But that invisible fact was now manifested in a definite sign, and actually contemporaneously with the moment in which the unbelief of the Jewish people became in the most glaring manner a world-historical phenomenon—in the death-suffering of Christ, which it inflicted upon Him. When in so momentous an hour, in an extraordinary manner, the curtain which veiled the Holy of Holies was rent, this must appear to the believing mind as a sign from God that the old worship of the temple was now abrogated, and for the time to come rejected, by Jehovah. But it is not God's manner to abolish old institutions without bringing forward their essential principle in new appointments. He does not allow the shell to break until the kernel is fully ripened. Even in this point Christ is the very image of the Father—Christ as not having come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. And such a fulfilment was even now coming to pass. In the place of the symbolic atonement came the real one in all its powers. The work of the real High Priest abro-

[1] According to Luke's account (ver. 45), the rending of the veil might be considered as a sign of the approaching earthquake, since here also it follows the darkening of the heaven.

[2] See above, p. 96.

gated the symbolic priesthood; the sacrifice of His blood, in the power of His everlasting Spirit, supplanted the types of the symbolic blood of the sacrifice of animals; the symbolic day of atonement was displaced by the holy feast-day of the great surrender of Christ to the Father in the name of humanity; and the offering of the real sacrificial blood did not occur in that place where the presence of the holy God was represented by mysterious signs and terrible concealment, but publicly on the accursed place of execution, where Jesus found the presence of His God even in the midst of the horror of apparent desertion by Him, in the midst of ignominy and shame, suffering and death, in the glory of grace, and surrendered Himself to the Holy One with the sacrifice of His life. If we now keep in view the characteristic fact that Jesus accomplished His sacrifice through death and entered into the holiest of all; the true holiest of all is, in fact, heaven itself.[1] But the real veil which, at the same time with the symbolical one, was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, is therefore that terrible curtain of the fear of death, of the suffering of death, and of judgment, which had until then terrified humanity, and thus deterred it from returning to God. With the death of Jesus this curtain is rent in twain—this was to be intimated by that sign of God in the temple. It is rent in twain from the top to the bottom, or, as Luke says, rent in the midst. The old heathen horror and Jewish trembling at suffering, at the cross, at disgrace, and the night of death, and at the judicial administration of God in this relation, is completely dissolved through Christ for all who believe on Him. The Christian finds now, in the midst of the judgment of Christ, the atonement; and by this knowledge, again, he finds the peace of the atonement, even in the judgments of his life. The entrance into the holiest of all, the admittance to the throne of grace, is thus free for all the world through the blood of Christ—for all who come thither in the power and fellowship of His death.

Another event which, according to Matthew, was associated with the death of Christ, was still more mysterious. We must seek to follow out the view of the Evangelist according to its inward motives, even to the point where He allows this event to appear in the full expression of its mysterious nature. Thus

[1] Heb. ix. 24.

the first change which was connected with the death of Jesus was that the veil of the temple was rent. Thus an essentially new relation appeared in the centre of the present spiritual world. Thereupon was perceived the earthquake itself. Rending of rocks testified of His power, and proved that earthly nature itself had experienced the influence of this suffering of death. But here, in the deep foundations of the earthly sphere, the effect of Christ's death did not cease. The Evangelist continues: 'And the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose.' Thus the death of Jesus has not only changed the relations of this present spiritual world in association with the circumstances of the earthly world, but also the relations of the after world of spirits of the kingdom of the dead in its deepest ground and centre, and has therewith announced a gradual transformation of it, which must one day be completed.

But whence has the Evangelist any certain information of the last event? 'And they came out of their graves.' He relates further: 'And after His resurrection they went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.' These appearances form the foundation of this special information. The poetic colouring of the narrative cannot justify us in this case in denying its historical intention and nature. In a circle of living people, which was equally friendly to the saintly dead and to the living Evangelists, several men contemporaneously, after the resurrection of Christ, related that the spirits of pious dead people appeared to them. These appearances had the peculiarity, that they were so frequent—that the risen saints appeared to many. In that case, they represented themselves to those who saw them in the dawn of the new life of corporeality. They were thus of a happier kind—blossoms of resurrection; and they even characterized themselves thus, that they referred all to the death of Jesus, although they did not appear till after His resurrection.

First of all, it is manifest that the Evangelist answers for the truth of those occurrences by His testimony. In the circle of believers, sights of this kind were frequently experienced after the resurrection,—appearances, namely, of risen saints. But, consequently, the Spirit of truth also which guided the Evangelist gives security, as a spirit of examination, for the objective truth of these events. The visions of good men in the world of time were actually occasioned by changes in the condition of spirits in the

kingdom of the dead, in which changes the future resurrection was announced; and these visions were caused by intelligence which related to the resurrection. But that the Evangelist intended to speak of the commencement of a proper resurrection, and of purely external appearances—this does not appear from his statement. The great fact to him is rather this, that the death of Jesus exercises an animating influence upon the world of the dead,—that this is first of all expressed in the kingdom of the pious dead, in the beginnings of embodiment, and made itself known by wonderful bright appearances in the night-life of pious living persons.

Thus the death of Christ has annulled death, even down into the kingdom of the dead. He declared His power in all the spheres of life. In mighty signs He has manifested Himself as the power of the awakening of spirits, of the reconciliation of the world, of the glorification of the earth, and of the resurrection of the dead.

NOTES.

1. The supposition of the ancient Church, that in the crucifixion both the hands and feet of the Lord were nailed to the cross, was disputed since 1792, by Dr Paulus, who maintained that the feet of Jesus were only bound. This assertion was expressly confuted by Hengstenberg, Hug, and Bähr. (Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 367.) Lately Hug has reverted to the question in his *Gutachten*, ii. 174. Compare also Friedlieb, p. 144. The text referred to in Luke furnishes the first proof of the complete nailing. The testimonies of the oldest fathers of the Church confirm this—fathers who wrote upon this subject at a time when the punishment of the cross was still in use, especially the passage in Tertullian, adv. Marcion, I. iii. 19, where he represents the nailing referred to of the hands and of the feet as the peculiar atrocitas crucis. See Neander, p. 464. Among the testimonies in the heathen writings, the familiar passage in Plautus (*Mostellaria*, Act II., scene i. 13) has considerable weight.

> 'Ego dabo ei talentum, primus qui in crucem excucurrerit
> Sed ea lege, ut offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia.'

Here, for instance, it is assumed that the hands and the feet are

similarly affixed. Hug has adduced special data in his *Gutachten;* still the quotation, which relates of a Turkish crucifixion of the 13th century, cannot perhaps be considered as proof. Sepp has a special proof that the feet also were nailed, namely, 'those who were marked with the stigmata since St Francis of Assisi.' 'The nailing of the feet was done in two ways: namely, they were placed, in the one case, over one another; in the other, they were placed by the side of one another. In respect of the crucifixion of Christ, sometimes the former and sometimes the latter manner has been supposed.'—Friedlieb, 145. The unusual ways of crucifying, for example, with the head downwards and otherwise, are mentioned in Friedlieb, 146, et seq. Upon the sign of the cross among the ancients, see Sepp, iii. 573.

2. Upon the import of the words כָּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלָי, compare Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, i. 178; Hitzig, *die Psalmen*, ii. 37; Ewald, *die Psalmen*, 168. The agreement especially of the Alexandrine and Syriac versions is in favour of the usual ecclesiastical interpretation. When, however, Hengstenberg desires to show that the text cannot in this sense refer either to David or to any other sufferer except the Messiah, he proceeds from a standing which does not distinguish between the lyrically unconscious prophecies, which generally pervade the Psalms (*according to their nature*), and the portions that contain historically conscious prophecies. And this argument is substantially turned against himself, if it is remembered that the Psalm must first of all set forth the poet's feeling. Ewald, with reason, insists that the word must be taken in the connection of the situation described. Therefore the passage speaks of a sufferer whom the adversaries have already condemned to death, and whose clothes they are purposing to divide. Thus he understands, with reference to the root, כור, כאר, etc., the word which he reads, כָּאֲרוּ, of binding, chaining. But the word appears actually in the connection to be intended to convey a much deeper sorrow. Perhaps the view of the poet is engaged with these images. In vers. 13 and 14, the enemies compass him about. In 15 and 16, his bodily strength and his living courage entirely give way, and he sinks down. In vers. 17 and 18, they begin to lay hold on him, surrounding him like greedy dogs (smelling around and snapping) to destroy him. Here is suggested a considerable enhancement for the parallel case, which as yet is to be expected. The image

of the dogs may be enhanced, when it is said of the wicked that they fall like a lion upon his hands and feet (as if to gnaw them off). The interpretation of Paulus and Hitzig corresponds to this. Just in the same way, moreover, the image of the eagerness with which they show enmity to him may be enhanced. This occurs as well in Ewald as in the ecclesiastical interpretation. Whilst, however, the latter, according to ordinary comprehension, is little accommodated or clear, the former gives, as we have said, a meaning too feeble. Thus, we might be inclined to give the preference to the interpretation of Fuller and Jahn, who, following Aquila, give to the word כארי the meaning fœdare, if this meaning were properly established (comp. thereupon Hengstenberg, 181). The dogs, for instance, had already begun to gnaw the limbs of the sufferer, to tear off their flesh. The picture of the mistreatment is completed, ver. 17. The destruction of the sufferer is then considered as decided, when the adversaries began to part his garments among them, ver. 18. He seems to them to be destroyed. But now, moreover, he attains new vitality in the recourse to his God, although, so to speak, he gets into the jaw of the lion, ver. 21. The frequent recurrence of the lion's mouth commends, especially in one passage, the interpretation;—'as a lion.' But still the old interpreters must have had significant reasons in their agreement for their view. But if we abide by this, the view must probably be thus defined, that the teeth of grinning wild beasts must have at first hacked (yea, *pierced through*) the hands and feet of the sufferer; and this remains a vivid prophecy of the passion of the cross.

3. Strauss intimates (ii. 523) that the author of the fourth Gospel must have gathered the information about the soldiers sharing among themselves the clothes of Jesus, and casting lots upon His vesture, from the passage in Ps. xxii. 19, and that without consideration of the Hebrew parallelism in that place. 'So that we should thus have in the fourth Evangelist precisely the same treatment which we have found in the history of the Entry. In the case of the first, in both cases, there is the reduplication of an originally single feature, arising from a mistaken apprehension of the ו in the Hebrew parallelism.' We should thus have the very remarkable circumstance, that the first Evangelist does not recognise the Hebrew parallelism in the first case; in the second, however, he has recognised it; whilst, on the other hand,

the fourth Evangelist did appreciate the parallelism in the first case, but in the second did not. Upon the assumed difficulty that the first Gospel seems to imply that the lots were cast upon all the garments of Jesus, comp. Ebrard, 436.

4. Tradition has given names to both the thieves. See Sepp thereupon, 557. Upon the tradition in respect of the age of Mary and of John at the time of the crucifixion, see Sepp, 560.

5. The many relations between the 22d Psalm and the history of the passion, which induced Tertullian to observe of that psalm, that it contained 'totam Christi passionem,' have been rightly brought forward by Strauss (ii. 525); but if thereupon anything should be inferred against the authenticity of the evangelic history of the passion, it proceeds out of the some horror entertained by the critic against all prophetic significance in the relation between the Old and New Testaments, which has induced him so often to regard the greatest New Testament facts as the paltriest imitations of Moses, arising from Old Testament sympathies.

6. The contradictions that Strauss seeks to discover in the several narratives of the Evangelists upon the presence of the friends of Jesus at the crucifixion, in that the two first merely mention several Galilean women; Luke, all the acquaintances of Jesus, and thus probably also the twelve; but the fourth Evangelist names John, and among the women, 'instead of the mother of the sons of Zebedee, the mother of Jesus,'—are probably sufficiently explained by the remark that the individual Evangelists have not sought to draw up any register of the friends of Jesus who were present beneath the cross; but, besides, they may be explained from the fact that their several assertions, as has been shown, rest upon the most subtle shades of the individual evangelic recollection, view, and representation.

The same remark applies to the communication of the seven sayings, as recorded by the several reporters. Comp. Ebrard.

7. On the narrative of the darkening of the sun at the death of Jesus, Strauss remarks, that the supposition 'of a supernatural origin of the darkness, in default of any sufficient purpose for such a miracle, appears without foundation.' As regards the supernatural origin, Theism must needs maintain such an origin for all obscurations of the earth and sun, irrespective of the mediation of the same by nature. But if the critic here

finds the mysterious fact without foundation, in 'default of any sufficient purpose,' it is to be added to the long score of his offences against his own philosophy and his own dogmatism. Assuredly, according to such criticism, one might expunge from history everything of deep significance, everything mysterious, everything ætherially subtle, tragically great, theocratically marvellous; nay, everything that should seem strange to the common-place mind, in officially pronounced default of a sufficing purpose. Even in the rending of the veil of the temple our teleologic critic again will feel the absence of the purpose. It is remarkable that the critic probably has a consciousness that the several extraordinary events at the death of Jesus must have been only several branches of one great event, but that he nevertheless separates them into wholly distinct prodigies—darkening of heaven, rending of the veil, and earthquake.

Upon the mention of the darkening of the earth recorded by the Evangelists, in ancient writers, comp. Neander, 467. 'The fathers of the first century refer frequently to a statement made by Phlegon, the author of a chronicle under the Cæsar Hadrian. Eusebius quotes his words in his *Chronicon*, under the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad: *ἔκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῶν ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον, καὶ νὺξ ὥρα ἕκτη τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι.*' A great earthquake in Bithynia had destroyed most part of Nicæa (l. c. p. 614). Consequently, the eclipse of the sun mentioned by Phlegon was no ordinary one, but a phenomenon associated with a great earthquake. Hence, when Hug remarks that the passage of Phlegon is nothing to the purpose, because he speaks of an eclipse of the sun, which is not to be thought of at the time of the Israelitish Passover, he has overlooked the close relation of that eclipse to the earthquake. Strauss remarks against the application of the passage, that in it there is only the Olympiad mentioned, scarcely the year; but certainly not the time of year nor the day. From the omission of the last, indeed, no difficulty would arise if it were conceded that the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad was about coincident with the year of Jesus' death, 783. But the two historical points, according to our chronological assumptions, do not harmonize sufficiently for us to appeal to the passage indicated, since the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad falls in the year 785 U.C., thus two years too

late for us (Brinkmeier, *Chronologie*, 208). The more accurate definitions we leave to the consideration of chronologists. Even from the circumstance that the ancients frequently referred eclipses that occurred to the deaths of great men which followed nearly at the same time, Strauss will borrow an argument against the reality of this darkness. On the other hand, Hug observes: 'At the death of Romulus there occurred an eclipse, also at the death of Cæsar, and also at the going out of Pelopidas to the ill-omened murder of Perseus,' etc. Hence the following conclusion is drawn: 'Instead of being defences of the credibility of the evangelic history, these parallels are so many premisses to the conclusion that even here we have only a Christian tradition, arising out of widely diffused ideas, which would have all nature join with her solemn garb of mourning in solemnizing the tragic death of the Messiah.' A counter question is, Are the appearances themselves untrue, because the popular opinion conceived that when they occurred together with great events, preceded or followed them, they were associated with them, and took them for heavenly intimations—ostenta, portenta, prodigia? In fact, and finally, extraordinary phenomena must be actually taken out of the recollection of the world, in order fundamentally to remove the indestructible inclination of 'susceptible people' to bring the great moments in the life of nature into relation with the great moments in the history of humanity.

By the *καταπέτασμα* can only be meant the curtain of the Holy of holies; not, as Hug thinks (188), the outer veil (comp. Heb. vi. 19, ix. 3, x. 20). Hug thinks that the high priests would have hushed it up if it had been the inner curtain. Sepp, on the other hand (581), says that the priest who looks after the evening sacrifice in the temple had related with pale astonishment to the people outside what had happened. If we consider the great inaccessibility of the Holy of holies, it is clear that in the case mentioned the temple itself was made inaccessible for a while to most of the priests, until the Holy of holies was veiled again, and the curtain was again repaired, and that thus a cessation in the worship of sacrifice would arise. Thence probably such an event must have been known to the people. Strauss finds it difficult, according to the order of precedence of Lightfoot, to

refer the rending of the veil to the earthquake, since it is not easily understood 'how this latter would be able to rend a flexible, freely suspended curtain.' It has been answered thereto that that curtain was strained (Sepp, iii. 510). But then Strauss asks again, how it happened that no part of the building was destroyed previously. On the other hand, however, it is asked, Whence is the critic aware that this was not the case? According to Jerome, the gospel of the Hebrews related that an immense beam of the temple did fall down. If we suppose, then, that such a beam fell athwart the covering of the veil, we have suggested to us the possibility of the rent occurring from the top to the bottom. The Jewish tradition plainly points to noticeable events in the temple, when it relates that, forty years before the destruction of the temple, the light on the golden candlestick was extinguished, the gate of the temple flew open at night-time of its own accord, etc. (comp. Sepp, 581). Even in kindred traditions, which refer to the time of the destruction of the temple itself, the gloomy feeling of the Jewish people is expressed that God had forsaken the temple (Tacit. Hist. v. 13). For the rest, if a critic will suppose that the New Testament writers must have appealed to the rending of the veil in the arguments against the Jews (Strauss, 537), we are reminded of the familiar charge of that critic, that John the Baptist must have testified to the Messiahship of Jesus, on the authority of his mother Elizabeth.

Even for the appearances of the spirits which were connected with the death of Christ, Strauss again can find no 'sufficient purpose.' On several explanations of the place referred to, compare Strauss, 541.

8. At the close of the consideration of the crucifixion, the critic (Strauss) refers to the time. 'The numbering of the hours makes a peculiar difficulty in this case.' We have noticed it above.

END OF VOL. IV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

00059194

Digitized with financial assistance from

Government of Maharashtra

on 30 January, 2020